THE ETHNOSTATE

Wilmot Robertson

The Ethnostate

ALSO BY WILMOT ROBERTSON

The Dispossessed Majority

Ventilations

The Ethnostate

An Unblinkered Prospectus for an Advanced Statecraft

Wilmot Robertson

HOWARD ALLEN CAPE CANAVERAL

To the Brave and Indomitable Enabler

Set roses here: surround her only with such maidens
As speak her tongue.

Edna St. Vincent Millay,
The Hardy Garden

Contents

	Foreword	ix
	Introduction	1
Chapter 1	Up the Devolution!	5
Chapter 2	The Mortality of Culture	35
Chapter 3	Diversity Contra Pluralism	46
Chapter 4	The Morale Factor	54
Chapter 5	Enlightened Foreign Policy	60
Chapter 6	Unitary Politics	70
Chapter 7	Social Progress	106
Chapter 8	Maverick Economics	121
Chapter 9	Educational Benefits	146
Chapter 10	On the Evolutionary Track	163
Chapter 11	Futurology	170
Chapter 12	Unguessing History	184
Chapter 13	Less Law, More Justice	194
Chapter 14	The Media Muddle	200
Chapter 15	The Religious Gene	204
Chapter 16	In Sum. . .	222
	Appendix	226
	Bibliography	232

Foreword

In an earlier book, *The Dispossessed Majority,* the author was hopeful, but not too hopeful, that a sharp white backlash to minority racism and cultural degeneration might save what appeared to be the doomed United States. Twenty years ago he still believed it possible that his moribund country could revive, clean out its political and cultural Augean Stables, and establish a *Pax Americana* that would herald a new age of peace, plenty and progress. Now that more than two decades have passed, events are proving that America, as we have known it, is beyond saving. The Majority, that is, the Northern and Western European elements of the population, has lost whatever chance it had to recapture the country it ruled for more than two centuries. Defeatist as it may sound, this does not mean it is too late to save the Majority as a *people.* This could be effected by breaking up the United States into small independent regions, established in the areas where most of America's various population groups are concentrated and gathered. The same process of fragmentation and regrouping might save the peoples of Western Europe, who are also in a period of steep social and cultural decline, though by no means to the same extent as the American Majority.

What is called for is a new form of goverment that would transform socially destructive into socially constructive forces. Race, now actively tearing countries apart, might be helpful in putting them back together, but this time in the form of autonomous, relatively self-sufficient collectivities that the author has chosen to designate as ethnostates. Since nothing else seems to be working, since every new day brings with it

new demographic horrors, a little rethinking of the fundamental themes and axioms of modern statecraft might be in order.

Although the author is an American, he will not confine his remarks to what used to be his country, but will aim many of them overseas. Inescapably, however, his emphasis will be on the United States, not only because of his birth and upbringing, but also because what is happening in the Western world in these parlous times is happening first in America. To employ Spengler's term, but without accepting his organic view of history, the Decline of the West is accelerating faster in the United States than elsewhere. Consequently, the suggestions advanced in this book for halting and reversing this decline should have the highest priority for Euro-Americans, the most threatened of all white population groups, South African whites excepted. Europeans and their racial cousins in Canada, Australia and New Zealand have more time and may get out of their rut with less effort, though the chances that their social order will survive the battering of minority racism and decadent liberalism in the long term are not significantly better.

Introduction

We have all heard more than enough of world revolution in the 20th century. Mass graves are filled with people who were executed with revolutionary and counterrevolutionary phrases ringing in their ears. It is now abundantly clear that instead of putting mankind on the right track to a successful social order, the compass of revolution, particularly revolutionary Marxism, has steered millions, tens of millions and hundreds of millions onto the reefs of economic sterility, political breakdown and social disease.

It is indicative of the deep slough of mental confusion in which we are mired that Darwinism, the most plausible theory to explain the origin and development of life forms, is still believed, when believed at all, as a sort of "evil truth," while Marxism, which in both theory and practice has proved to be irreparably flawed, is, despite the recent events in the Soviet Union, still looked upon favorably by large segments of the world's intelligentsia.

If Darwin is right or closest to being right, is it not time to organize mankind according to his rules of organic development and close our ears to the a priori fulminations of class warriors? By Darwinism, of course, is not meant Social Darwinism, a Hobbesian scenario of people fighting tooth and claw for survival in a solipsistic frenzy of produce and consume. To Darwin, "survival of the fittest" (Herbert Spencer's term) meant simply that life forms which adapted most skillfully to their environments had the best chances of producing

an enduring line of progeny. Neo-Darwinians take advantage of Mendelian genetics to propose that the beneficial mutations which increase an organism's opportunities of survival will in some cases result in the creation of a new and occasionally higher species. Since this process works most effectively in isolated groups, it is only reasonable to suppose that it would operate more successfully for men and women living in small homogeneous states than in vast multiracial political imperiums where beneficial mutations, especially if they occurred in recessive genes, would be swamped before they could take hold in a large population mix.

It is not too difficult to play tricks with Hegelian dialectics. Marx proposed that feudalism (thesis) passed into capitalism (antithesis) only to be resolved by communism (synthesis). Why not monoracial feudal fiefdoms (thesis) evolving into huge multiracial political agglomerations (antithesis) eventually to be resolved by ethnostates (synthesis)? Wordplay aside, the ethnostate can be defined as the political entity best suited to accelerate human evolution.

The ultimate goal of most forms of socialism is one world, one society, one race—a political "end times" that flies in the face of the biological process which produced man, the greatest of all biological marvels. The evolution of all living things has been generated by variety, by genetic branching, by the synergistic mechanics of speciation, in which different phyla, genera and races branch out in all directions, some to extinction, some—much less frequently—to a higher evolutionary grade. What is more drab than a continent-sized garden containing only one kind of flower? What would be more eye-catching than a landscape dotted with innumerable small gardens, each with its own array of distinct blooms, each tilled and fertilized in such a way as to bring out the fullest fragrance, color and beauty of its floral riches?

The ever-present urge to worldwide conformity would seem to augur a winding down of evolution. A faint death rattle can already be heard in the ecumenical squawks of Western politicians and liberal churchmen, and in the ear-piercing cacophony of most modern music, both popular and serious.

If all civilization is not threatened, at least certain civilized peoples are. The most threatened are the whites, whose low birthrates can be mathematically represented by a curve converging almost to zero. Endangered species, ethnic suicide and genocide are not unduly exaggerated terms for what is happening to the same race which only a few short centuries ago was dispatching its large population surplus to the ends of the earth.

The antidote to the present crisis, to the ever echoing, sirenic call of One World, is not counterrevolution. It is something even more extreme. It is devolution, which is not a reversal of revolution. Devolution proceeds from the big to the small, from the roof to the foundation, from erratic electrons to the stable nucleus. World revolution is an explosion. World devolution is an implosion, a contraction, a recoiling from a unitary to a diversified world, from top-heavy, ungainly empires and artificially contrived states to more manageable "core" states, where society rests on the hard rock of genes and culture instead of the quicksands of proletarian myths, egalitarian fantasies and retouched history. To put it in crass political terms, devolution is the surrender or delegation of powers formerly held by a central government to regional or provincial authorities.*

The earth abounds with population groups whose distinct characteristics set them apart. Some fit the description of races, others are better described as subraces or ethnic groups. Although it is the intellectual fashion these days to deny or downplay serious and significant human variations, particularly variations in intelligence and character, population groups do possess a matrix of visible and invisible differences—different physical and mental traits, different art styles, as well as different gods.

* Many words with the "de" and "dis" prefix will appear throughout this study: decomposition, degeneration, deteriorate, disintegrate, disestablish, displace. The one that will appear most often—devolution—is the word that is likely to be the most misunderstood. The principal dictionary definition of devolution is quite plain: "the transference (as of rights, powers, or responsibility) to another; *esp*: the surrender of powers to local authorities by a central government".

The ethnostate is designed to accommodate and profit from group differences by giving Mother Nature her head and enlisting Darwinism in the service of political science. Who can say that evolutionary theory is not as qualified as other non-political theories to intrude into world politics.

Darwinism is not an ideology. It is a complex biological hypothesis about the chain of being. It is not a wild, syllogistic leap to infer that the ground rules of organic evolution might have some application to the organic institutions known as states. If new biological species evolve more rapidly and successfully in isolation, so might species of politics. If different environments call forth and stimulate immense powers of adaptation in all living things, why should not a mosaic of the world's or at least the West's population groups maximize such powers? Primitive ethnostates once existed wherever isolated tribes existed. Several city states of ancient Greece might have qualified as model ethnostates, were it not for the Greek propensity for slavery. Reviewing the Western past, the author suggests that perhaps the closest political entities to what he has in mind were some city states in medieval Italy and Germany.

Today, when we have virtually removed nature from our daily life, it might be wise and timely to let her work her wonders again, this time with intelligent human cooperation. At this point, no one, neither man nor nature, is in charge of the selective process that lifted us out of the soup of a primeval sea. In fact, in many areas of the world, evolution seems to be running backwards. Devoting some serious thought to devolution and the ethnostate concept might help to put it back on track.

Chapter 1

Up the Devolution!

The earth's peoples are being herded into an ideological pen by advocates of globalism at the very moment large, unwieldy political agglomerations like the Soviet Union are disintegrating into states and regions with older and more authentic pedigrees. This political restructuring of the U.S.S.R has a special appeal to population groups that were forced to shed or dilute their historical uniqueness when they were incorporated into a large multiracial, multicultural nation or empire. The United States has not yet reached the level of decomposition of what was once the Communist fatherland, but its cultural and racial centrifuge spins faster every month.

It is hardly surprising that the population group which comprises the majority of a country will not voluntarily give up its preferred status or see its power appreciably weakened. No group wishes to watch what it regards as its own country being chopped up, especially in the case where one or more minorities has acquired as much or more political and economic power than what Germans call the *Staatsvolk*. Some members of what was once a majority may be globalists at heart, but they cannot stomach any political developments that successfully diminish their own sovereignty or elevated status.

What has been largely missing from the devolution movement so far has been a carefully formulated line of action to give it logical substance. One way to get in the devolutionary mood is to do some philosophical housecleaning. Despite

what Thomas Jefferson has drilled into our heads, "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" is not the be-all and end-all of the human condition. Neither is that triple-pronged French shibboleth, *liberté, egalité, fraternité,* nor the doltish Marxist commandment, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." All these articles of faith were promulgated at times and places far removed from those which exist today.

Indeed, Mr. Jefferson, we still are very interested in *life.* But today we want life for the planet, not just for ourselves—life for plants, animals, protozoa and chromosomes. There was no such word as ecology at the time of the American, French and Russian revolutions. There is such a word today. All of us would do well to add it to our shrinking vocabulary.

Liberté? In our lifetime, we have had some, lost some and recovered some. The course of liberty often follows the arc of a pendulum—from little to excessive and back to little again. Most states at most times have had less rather than more liberty, but kings, priests, lawyers, even lowly citizens have at one moment or another enjoyed sufficient liberty of thought and action to try to loosen the shackles of church and state. Taboos exist in totalitarian states; taboos exist in democracies. Breaking taboos in authoritarian regimes may mean death; in democracies the penalty may be social ostracism and penury. In either case, liberty is significantly curbed.

Liberty is always relative. Essentially, it is a byproduct of the will of the people, the lay of the land and the condition of the state. Those who cry for more liberty should really cry for a higher culture that recognizes the value of liberty. Who or what can produce a higher culture? A more intelligent body politic would be a first step.

Egalité? No one is equal to anyone else, not even identical twins. Politicians in democracies, instead of rhapsodizing over equality, should accept the fact of human inequality and devote their talents to making the best, not the worst, of it. Every sane person is fit for some occupation, for some niche in life. Constant appeals to equality become psychological sores. We are what we are. The trouble starts when we let envy

and resentment deny our differences. The acceptance and recognition of these variances is a brake to envy and a spur to a higher appreciation of the richness of the human tapestry. When equality is reduced from an impossible ideal and an excuse for violence to a meaningless cliché, everyone will breathe easier. Our stay on this blue planet is a short one. We should make the most of these fleeting moments and not waste them at the urging of demagogues who urge us to achieve the unachievable. Let us be thankful for our inequality. What a drab world this would be if we were all cast in the same mold.

Fraternité. Obviously all men have similarities, just as they have differences. But they are never brothers. It is wiser to base our behavior on this truth than to pretend otherwise. Our ability does not make us fraternal. Fraternity applies to people who feel close to each other, people of similar race and culture. To sell brotherhood to men and women of different races, separated not only by genetics but by obvious differences in religion, art, language and historical background, is an exercise in futility. The brotherhood based on slogans, not genes, will snap under the least pressure. Like liberty and equality, fraternity has a pretty sound, but at bottom it is an *ignis fatuus* that has led us and continues to lead us into a quicksand of broken hopes and promises. Woodrow Wilson called on the brotherhood of man to make the world safe for democracy. Communists called upon the proletariat to rise up and cast off its chains. All such words do is deceive good men by overloading their hearts with false expectations.

As to the "pursuit of happiness," this materialistic, hedonistic goal, which tends to define mankind as a sort of pleasure-seeking machine, is hardly a worthy one. Of all the pursuits to choose from, happiness should come after, not before, education, art, philosophy, health and good government. Happiness can be pursued for itself, but it is more likely to be achieved vicariously by the pursuit of more significant and meaningful goals. For this reason hedonism remains the great chink in Jefferson's philosophical and political armor.

Men should respect, not deify, both individual and collective freedom. There are nobler and higher aims, such as preparing

to climb the next rung in the evolutionary ladder. Just as *Homo sapiens* evolved from *Homo erectus,* and *Homo erectus* from earlier hominids, and earlier hominids from primates, *Homo supersapiens* "must" evolve from *Homo sap.* The word "must" is used advisedly because the alternative to upward evolution is downward and retrograde evolution. If civilization can slip back into barbarism, as it often has, who can say that this time it will not permanently remain in reverse gear? The scene in some of the world's largest cities suggests that modern man is already degrading into a more primitive species. Who can know for certain that man will not some day decline into a lower-order organism and disappear forever? The possibilities are endless for his downgoing; the chances for his upgoing quite limited.

If, thanks to some beneficial mutation, man has the ability and the will to make the quantum jump into a higher evolutionary grade, the question arises: From what ethnic group will he emerge? Everyone, of course, will root for his home team. Members of the Northern European branch of the white race, who have been top dogs until recently, should make every effort to keep their group in the pink of mental and physical condition if they are not going to lose out permanently to the Japanese or members of some other Mongoloid race. As with gifted children who are singled out and assigned to advanced classes, so the more gifted members of every race should be provided with whatever is needed to help fulfill their individual and collective potential. It goes without saying that these special students should not have their education slowed by being forced to move at the pace of less capable and less astute learners. Gifted pupils often become so bored at the repetitive lessons required by the slow student that they may develop a lifelong antipathy to education. At the same time, slow learners are made tragically aware of their own deficiencies by being compelled to compete with bright pupils. Rather than continue this hopelessly unequal battle, they drop out.

When we speak of intelligence we mean more than verbal acumen and quick thinking. We are also speaking of such important character traits as a fine sense of moral responsibility,

the ability to concentrate, and a serious attitude towards life. The absence of these and similar traits in a genius with an IQ of 180 could make him more of a menace than a boon to mankind. It follows that the population group best qualified to produce the *Übermensch* will need much more than a high genetic quotient of intelligence.

Assuming that members of the Northern European branch of the white race and their descendants overseas are still contemporary favorites in the evolutionary race, this is not to say that other races should consider themselves out of the running. Genetics can play strange tricks. Scores of white, black and yellow launching pads should be constructed to speed the advent of a higher life form. In the meantime every race cannot help but obtain immense physical and mental benefits from strenuous competitive efforts in advancement.

Since this competition throws every population group back upon its own capabilities and resources, it will discourage interference and bullying from other groups. Nothing distorts and retards true cultural development more than interference by outsiders, either through what is called cultural imperialism, direct military intervention or massive immigration. One of the worst cases of what might be called culturecide was the West's high-handed intrusion into the lives and customs of the Polynesian peoples. White diseases, white religion, white trade, white mores all combined to corrupt one of the world's most colorful life-styles. Such acts of desecration, with which history is replete, must be stopped at all costs. Invaders, whether armed with holy books, machine guns or alien customs, bring with them cultural as well as physical diseases, for which indigenous peoples have little or no immunity. The loss of morale and feelings of inferiority caused by the presence of technologically and industrially advanced strangers can well be a prelude to ethnic dissolution and anomie. Whatever élan the natives have managed to retain will be wasted on cultural preservation rather than on cultural advancement.

Separation and reduction into small-scale political units, not accelerated coagulation into ever larger nations, empires and spheres of interest, should be the political prescription for the

future. But since this goes against the grain of globalist thinking, which still holds sway in most Western power centers, devolution will only become mainstream politics after a revolutionary shift in popular attitudes.

Some parts of the West have already entered a tentative devolutionary phase, The centrifugal breakaway into disparate geographical, racial and cultural divisions now occurring in Eastern Europe is resurrecting and accelerating long-held separatist feelings elsewhere. Paradoxically, separatism may be the West's best hope of holding together. Only after the diseased whole has fragmented can the pieces be rearranged, reorganized and put back together to comprise a whole that is both healthier and greater than the sum of its parts.

Separatism. Population groups are not equal, no matter what liberal social scientists tell us, either out of the goodness of their hearts or for less charitable reasons. The most effective method to reduce the social frictions caused by inherent group inequalities is separation, a step which, as we shall see further on in this study, represents significant progress along the road to the ethnostate. Inequalities become much more apparent and galling when different races and subraces are forced to live side by side, where their unequal performance and different behavior cannot be concealed.

Gathering men and women of similar biological and cultural background into a state of their own eliminates the invidious racial comparisons of test scores in classrooms and achievements in later life. In an ethnostate, where the competition is limited to members of the same race, no racial factors will be dredged up to explain why some citizens get ahead and some are left behind. Whatever domestic disparities exist will have to be ascribed to individual and class differences.

Perhaps most important, the envy and frustration inherent in losing will be greatly reduced. Losers are less put out and angered when they are beaten by one of their own kind. Inequality among races living side by side sparks fearsome amounts of political, economic and social stress. Class inequalities, though always harbingers of instability, seldom boil over

until the economic differences become so sharp that the poor are driven to desperation. Individual inequalities incite criminality but otherwise are fairly manageable.

Despite their different prefixes, devolution and evolution are synergistic; that is, they give each other a political and social boost. Evolution propagates variety. Opposing any drift towards genetic sameness and cultural conformity tends to keep *Homo sapiens* on a progressive evolutionary path. A world of political mosaics, a world of ethnostates, a devolutionary world keeps the faith, so to speak, with Darwin and Mendel.

If mankind were one, one plague might be its death knell. Everyone would have the same lack of immunity to a new lethal disease. As an article in the Los Angeles Times (April 26, 1990) put it:

> If all family members are genetically alike, all will respond to changes in their environment in the same way. If one can't survive, all will perish.

Recall the Irish famine of the 1840s. Since all the potatoes were genetically similar, there were no varieties to resist the fungus that caused anywhere from a million to two million deaths and changed the racial composition of the United States. Had the Irish cultivated several varieties of potatoes, one or two might have had the genes to resist the fungus, which would have saved much of the crop. A monoracial humanity would be extremely vulnerable to any outbreak of a serious infectious disease, whereas the political and cultural isolation and geographical separation provided by ethnostates would significantly increase the possibility that some population groups would have varying degrees of resistance to different diseases, either old or new. An increase in human variety would also mean an increase in the possibility of genetic improvements. Mutations are always floating about in the human population, most bad, a few beneficial. Variety increases not only the number of mutations but the chance that a very few of them, the beneficial ones, could actually be preserved and distributed throughout an entire ethnic group.

In carefully tended gardens of genes, who can say what biological blooms might eventually dazzle the eye? Is it any won-

der that the ethnostate can be designated as the one form of statehood with solid scientific underpinnings? We are told that some 95% of all the species that ever existed on this planet have become extinct. At the current rate of habitat destruction another million species of plants, animals, insects, fish and birds will have disappeared by the end of this century. As a result, several governments have established biospheres (special environments) to save endangered plants and animals from extinction. Cary Fowler, director of the Rural Advancement Fund International, declares, "My guess is we've got another decade to collect genetic diversity or the game's over." Considered in this light, the ethnostate concept gains greatly in importance. It promises a ready-made biosphere for safeguarding not only plants and animals but also human beings.

Secession. One form of devolution is secession, defined as the voluntary severance of one part of the body politic from the whole body. Peaceful secession calls for the agreement of the two parties involved: the secessionists and the rulers of the state from which they wish to secede. This agreement is generally hard to obtain, with the result that secession has often provoked bloody civil wars, one of the most notable being the fratricidal conflict in the United States in 1861-65.

Secession, which is not always resisted or contested, takes place most often during the disintegration of empires and multiracial states. A prime example or examples are the many secessions now underway in the detritus of the Soviet Union. In many such cases the spinoff allows long-suppressed peoples to rediscover their old identity and recover their long-lost independence. The births of Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Yugoslavia, successor states of the Austro-Hungarian Empire after World War I, were sometimes violent, sometimes peaceful exercises in devolution, though the further fragmentation of Yugoslavia seven decades later was bathed in blood.

One of the "sacred texts" associated with an act of secession is the Declaration of Independence, which begins:

> When, in the course of human Events, it becomes necessary for one People to dissolve the Political Bands which have connected them with

> another, and to assume among the Powers of the Earth, the separate and equal Station to which the Laws of Nature and Nature's God entitle them...

These lofty words, written by a Jefferson inspired by roseate visions of freedom and liberty, were often heard in both the American Revolution and the War Between the States, the first a violent but successful instance of secession, the second a violent but unsuccessful one. The genetic damage suffered in the former conflict was minor. In the latter it was immense, so immense that all the advantages that came from binding the torn nation together and making possible its eventual rise to superpower status may have been negated by the loss of hundreds of thousands of potential fathers and millions of unborn sons and daughters of the young nation's founding stock. The severe drain on the reproductive potential of the core population group opened the door to the importation of vast numbers of white immigrants of disparate races and cultures.

Secession being a very serious act, it must at all costs be handled wisely and diplomatically. It would hardly be beneficial to a population group to secede from a large state and establish its own ethnostate, if the latter is immediately overrun and ravaged by the state from which it seceded or by a neighboring nation with expansionist tendencies. It makes little sense for a new state to risk certain war or invasion while it is in its weak, formative stages and while its chances of survival are minimal. Secession should be carefully planned and only undertaken when the time is ripe and the possibility of success extremely high. As has happened all too often in history, secessions have ended in massacres and in the extinction or near extinction of the secessionists.

Many, perhaps most, successful secessions have taken place in stages: first a campaign for federation, then for confederation, then for partial autonomy, as in the Swiss cantons. The larger state will resist much less vigorously if it is prepared—"broken in" as it were—for eventual separatism. When faced with a sudden separatist coup or *fait accompli*, forceful repression is not an uncommon response.

Devolutionaries. The theme of devolution has been touched on by other writers who, while carefully avoiding the racial factor, have pointed out that "bigness" is a principal cause of contemporary social problems. In his study, *The Breakdown of Nations*, Leopold Kohr, an Austrian-born economist, advances a cyclic theory of history that oscillates slowly back and forth from what he calls "districts" and small city states to integrationist empires, the latter becoming so huge, so far removed from man's original tribal state that they inevitably collapse of their own weight. The fragments then proceed to rearrange and reorganize themselves in more or less the same provinces, regions, territories or districts from which the nations and empires originally arose. In regard to old European provinces, Kohr writes:

> Their restoration would consequently not mean the creation of an artificial pattern, but a return to Europe's natural political landscape. No new names would have to be invented. The old ones are still in existence, as are the regions and peoples which they define. It is the great powers which lack the real basis of existence and are without autochthonous, self-sustaining sources of strength. It is they that are the artificial structures, holding together a medley of more or less unwilling little tribes. There is no "Great British" nation in Great Britain. What we find are the English, Scots, Irish, Cornish, Welsh and the Islanders of Man. In Italy we find the Lombards, Tyroleans, Venetians, Sicilians or Romans. In Germany we find Bavarians, Saxons, Hessians, Rhinelanders or Brandenburgers. And in France we find Normans, Catalans, Alsatians, Basques or Burgundians. These little nations came into existence by themselves, while the great powers had to be created by force and a series of bloodily unifying wars.

E. F. Schumacher pleads the case for smallness from a less political and more aesthetic perspective. In his bestseller, *Small Is Beautiful*, he catalogs all the various aspects of culture that have become too large either to be understood or appreciated. The late German-born architect, Mies van der Rohe, although he has designed several large buildings in North America, became at least a part-time member of the "Micro Club," following the utterance of his widely publicized aphorism, "Less is more."

No one has put the case for ethnostates in more concise and more convincing words than Bob Hunter, in his column for the North Shore News (June 6, 1990), a small suburban paper in

Vancouver, British Columbia:

> If the world was to be divided up into, say, 2,500 little countries, and the boundaries of each country were drawn to fit the contours of the national biological regions the natives inhabited, each country would become responsible for a shared biozone. . . .In theory, the inhabitants of each such region would have every reason to work together to preserve their area. Moreover, because they were indigenous, they could be counted on to have the best understanding of how to truly manage the [environment].

Hunter compared the Soviet Union, before its dissolution, to Canada in terms that would delight the most straitlaced ethnostatists:

> Neither nation has any organic tribal basis. Each represents a long string of conquests and occupations and deals and ripoffs, culminating in two almost polar-opposite political systems which are nevertheless almost identical at their core: Canada and the U.S.S.R. are incredibly centralized, bloated administrations, both of them. . . .Both are bureaucracies gone mad, having far too much control over affairs in distant parts of the imperium.

Hunter might have included the United States in the above paragraph. However, neither Kohr, Schumacher nor Hunter penetrated the heart of the matter because none based his devolutionary proposals on the racial element which can make or break any political entity. Kohr advocates the breakup of the superstates into small states, but never mentions the all-important biological aspect of the geographical and demographical "shrinkage" he is advocating. Small states that are home to several races and several cultures are no more, indeed often less, stable than heterogeneous superstates. The provinces and districts that Kohr praises were and in many cases still are monoracial. Yet he avoids any allusion to their racial homogeneity. Nor will he admit that his cyclic theory of history does not apply to most of the world's black and brown societies, many of which have never ventured into bigness. As the Odinist (Vol. 95, 1986) comments:

> If a society's physical size alone were the determining factor in unleashing its creativity, then every race, every people, and every nation at some time or another should have experienced a blossoming of culture comparable to that of Europe at its minuscule best. Such has definitely not been the case.

Similarly, Schumacher advances almost every argument he can summon up to make his case for smallness, except the monoracial one.

Kohr was half right in predicting the instability of nations and empires once they approached gigantism. But he was probably wrong when he wrote that fragmentation will only occur after a war between the superpowers. The Soviet Union has already fissioned and there is as yet no World War III in sight, though smaller, regional wars are always a possibility, particularly in ethnic hot spots like South Africa and the Middle East. As for the fission of the only remaining superpower, forces are currently at work which practically ensure that the America of A.D. 2050 will bear little resemblance in size and shape to the America of the 1990s.

Manageable Size. The basic *sine qua non* of an ethnostate, the prop on which it succeeds or fails, is racial and cultural homogeneity. We have already suggested that a second prop, almost as basic, is smallness. No government can be truly effective over the long haul if it presides over a huge territory, no matter how well integrated racially and culturally the population may be. The more distant geographically government is from the governed, the more removed it will be from the real concerns of its people.

Before proceeding any further, it should be pointed out that the size of the ethnostate not only refers to territory but also to population. If the personalization of government is to be one of the ethnostate's principal aims, the governed must not exceed a reasonable number. It is simply impossible for even the most ingenious statesmen to govern a country of 50, 100 or 200 million people without losing the personal touch that makes government acceptable, supportive and supportable

Thomas Jefferson's emphasis on ward government, in which most of the governing is exercised at the local level, almost seems as if he had an ethnostate in mind. A small state with a small, homogeneous population is obviously easier to manage than a large state with a heterogeneous population. Anyone who has ever attended a town meeting in a large city would

probably agree. More often than not, such confabs break up into acrimonious shouting matches.

Most large states obviously have an advantage over small ones in military resources, though not necessarily in military morale. Accordingly, all ethnostates should be kept as small as possible, both in regard to territory and population, if only to prevent the formation of big states whose size alone might tempt them to overwhelm a smaller neighbor. For defense against large ethnostates and large states that have not yet become ethnostates, economic and military alliances should be entered into by the smaller states to protect their sovereignty. Large states that exhibit signs of aggression should be informed in no uncertain terms that an attack on one member of such an alliance would be viewed as an attack on all members.

As will be pointed out in Chapter 5, nuclear weapons by their very awesomeness favor the defense of small states. What benefits would victory in war bring to an empire or nation that lost half or more of its industry, its cities and its population to a few well-aimed nuclear warheads on long-range missiles? The small state that launched the missiles would be utterly destroyed. But at what cost to the large state!

Because they still live in the world's largest territorial state, some Russians would like to see their ponderous Russian Federation divided into a European Russia and an Asian Russia (Siberia). Japan, the largest homogeneous nation, has far too many people for personalized government. The Japanese, if made aware of the advantages of decentralized rule, might allow greater autonomy to their reconstituted historical provinces and to their small and powerless Ainu and Korean minorities. (Japan, by the way, is not so culturally homogeneous that the Japanese cannot tell the geographical or provincial origins of their fellow citizens by their accents.)

Canada, another of the gargantuan states, has already entered a centrifugal phase. The French-speaking part of the country is moving towards almost total independence, while in Western Canada an increasingly vocal movement wants to secede from the government in Ottawa and shake off the financial control of Toronto. After Quebec spins off, Nova Scotia and New-

foundland will be cut off from the rest of English-speaking Canada. There is already talk in these two provinces about joining the United States.

America, another grotesquely oversized nation, has already become a mosaic (though not quite the "gorgeous mosaic" of New York City Mayor David Dinkins). Hispanics, largely from Mexico, crowd the Southwest. Cubans have all but taken over south Florida. Negroes, 30 million strong, are jammed into inner-city ghettos and scattered throughout the rural South. Large numbers of Jews, representing the top economic echelons in the largest cities, are particularly influential in New York, Los Angeles and Washington. Southern and Eastern Europeans populate the shrinking industrial areas of the East and Midwest. Most Americans of British descent have deserted the cities for the suburbs. Most Germans and Scandinavians live in the Midwest. French Canadians have concentrated in northern New England; Irish in urban areas; Scotch Irish in the South; most Asians in Hawaii and California; most Indians on their reservations. All these bits and pieces of American demography are available, if not yet willing, to be transformed with greater or lesser difficulty into separate ethnostates.

No hard and fast limits should be set on the size of an ethnostate's population and territory. There are too many imponderables and exceptions. Maximum area might be 36,000 square miles, roughly that of Portugal; maximum population, 15 million, the number of Hollanders. But racial and cultural homogeneity must be the deciding factors, not area and population.

Identity. One of the great psychological props of the ethnostate is that it will provide its citizens with a sense of identity, which in these pluralistic times is often hard to come by. Identity starts with self, proceeds to the family and extends to the neighborhood, town, city, county, borough, department (France), state (U.S and Germany) and finally to the nation. Remove any of these orbits surrounding the ethnic nucleus and a person's sense of identity is greatly weakened.

Throughout the West, individual and group identity is at risk

because it is increasingly difficult for a citizen of a multiracial nation to feel he has much in common with a fellow citizen, who, it is increasingly likely, may be of a different race and have emerged from an entirely different cultural background. The more people differ racially and culturally within a country, the more difficult it becomes for members of these different races to believe they share a common peoplehood. As a result, in a heterogeneous state the basic psychological need of every human being, the firm sense of belonging, is in short supply.

The German word *Heimat* has a stronger emotional tug than homeland, but both words convey the same meaning. *Heimat* stands for more than country or nation. It is a state of mind, a form of allegiance, an intensified feeling of belonging. It is the deep affection of the part for the whole. *Heimat* fuses the identity of the individual with the identity of the group and the habitat of the group. It incites people to capitalize on their cultural and genetic endowment. People who live in a multiracial or multicultural state do not have a *Heimat.*

Individual and group identity can be viewed as the backbone of the human psyche, an unbent vertebra of pride, behavior and character. Much is made these days of individual rights. *Heimat* is a group right. *Heimat* is *Sich-Finden* (not merely finding oneself but finding one's *self*). Every state worthy of the name recognizes the need for every individual and every family to have a home. The ethnostate is designed to fulfill the equally important need of all men and women for a community, for a collective home.

Can a person's nationality be identified by his appearance, dress and behavior? In some areas of the world the answer is still an automatic yes. Not so long ago practically everyone on earth carried his birthplace or citizenship on his sleeve. Tall, blond, long-headed men or women were tagged as Northern Europeans or at least of Northern European descent. Until the 1950s an "American" was not an Indian, Negro or Asian, not even a "dark white" from Mediterranean lands; he was a member of the dominant, mostly fair-complexioned race from Northern and Western Europe that in a few centuries had

turned a sparsely inhabited wilderness into a thriving world power.

The word "alienation," a favorite of Hegel and Marx, adequately describes the pessimistic mood of the majority of whites in the largest Western cities, which have become refuges for myriads of immigrants who neither look, speak nor act like their hosts, the numbers of whom are now declining as fast as the numbers of newcomers are multiplying. When strangers comprise a significant portion of the population of a country, when outsiders form their own neighborhoods in what was once "our" neighborhoods, we start to have doubts about who we are.

Whites in America used to be told that they were not only white, but belonged to a certain group of whites. Since the 1930s, however, few anthropologists have written or lectured about the racial differences that distinguish many Northern Europeans (Nordics) from Central Europeans (Alpines) and Southern Europeans (Mediterraneans). Today, partly due to the lack of such information, miscegenation in or out of marriage is busy dissolving racial distinctions almost everywhere in the West. Massive immigration, forced integration in education, employment and public housing, the low birthrate of whites and high birthrate of nonwhites—all such factors are watering down and in some cases obliterating the objective and subjective ways people depend on to establish and solidify their group consciousness.

Since the loss of identity affects the group as much as the individual, the difficulties of governing mount as the centrifugal forces that pull nations, neighborhoods and families apart grow stronger and the centripetal forces that bind them together grow weaker. The upshot is that multiracial states, the states most seriously threatened by the dynamics of fragmentation, are offered a choice of two alternatives: either to hold the centrifugal forces in check by some form of absolutism or succumb to them and let the state dissolve into smaller, more homogeneous substates, where bonds of race, culture and history are strong enough to keep the social order functioning.

An important psychological factor must be reckoned with in

any serious discussion of alienation at the national level. What happens when most of the inhabitants of a country no longer employ the personal pronoun "we" in describing themselves and their fellow citizens? If the country has become a welter of different races and cultures, the "we" will eventually come to stand for nothing more than a group of occupants of a particular geographical or demographical segment of the country in question. It is a truism that the average individual will generally fight to protect himself, his family and his property. But will he fight for what he no longer feels is "his," if "we" no longer exists and has been replaced by "them"? It is at this point that the intensity or lack of intensity of group consciousness may actually determine the group's—and the state's—survival.

The symbol of America, Uncle Sam, still displays white features—at least at this writing. But how much longer will 30 million Negroes, 22 million Hispanics and millions of Asians be content to accept a national "logo" or trademark which represents a race different from their own? What will be the color of Uncle Sam when nonwhites outnumber whites sometime in the middle of the 21st century, if present immigration and birthrate trends continue? Symbols in the form of flags, national anthems, even racial stereotypes can be effective in bringing and holding people together. But when they are no longer symbolic of the population at large, they become divisive. The expression "my country" generally includes a mental picture of a flag, a series of remembered historical events and the faces of noted public figures. But when the paraphernalia of patriotism becomes less and less meaningful to an ever larger share of the population, unity transmogrifies into disunity. Instead of a common history, each population group begins to compose its own interpretation of the past.

It is not just race that divides one nation from another and one man from another. Distance and geographical isolation, economic and regional distinctions, language and historical differences all play a part. Only rarely do racial similarity and a shared culture overcome linguistic differences, as in Switzerland, or religious differences, as in half-Protestant and half-

Catholic Holland.

In good economic times, in times of prosperity, low unemployment and high morale, the bonding forces of the state are weakened, only to strengthen again in a political or economic crisis or after defeat in war. When most everyone is doing fairly well and advancing a few notches on the comfort scale, racial and cultural antagonisms have a tendency to be sidetracked. They quickly come to the fore again when the unemployment rate mounts and family budgets decline to a bare subsistence level.

Rules of the Game. The ethnostate is intended to set the stage for the next step in political evolution, perhaps even human evolution. It represents a sweeping new approach to politics, one that differs greatly from the New World Order, the Wilsonian proclamation that emanated from the mouth of President George Bush during his war against Iraq. To narrow the fight for racial survival on appeals to tradition and the glories of the past definitely becomes counterproductive. Such outworn pleading no longer evokes any genuine response from political activists. It tells them that it is high time for them to become statesmen and political philosophers, high time for them to come up with something new, something right for the times, something to lift hearts.

If the earth, a lonely planet in a lonely galaxy, had feelings, they might resemble those of present-day whites caught in the ethnic kaleidoscope of a multiracial state.

Races cannot save other races; races can only save themselves. The beauty of the ethnostate is that, although it rests solidly on race, it promises great benefits to all races. In no way does it suggest the superiority of any one race, subrace or population group.

The predicament of whites in America (and to a lesser extent of whites in other parts of the fading white world) is that many of them know what should be done, but are ashamed to lift a finger. The media, having made any commonsensical approaches to race disrespectable, many whites are afraid to make known their unwavering dislike for the shape and con-

tent of what is called popular opinion (the erroneous term given to a distillate of the opinions of special interest groups). What a strange breed of prisoners whites have become! They know how to escape, but are afraid to take the first step. They know where the reef is, but keep sailing directly into it.

If whites really believed that the present trend of political, economic and social decay was irreversible, they would not try to slow the downhill rush, but accelerate it. With the arrival of total chaos, proposals for drastic solutions would become less censored and more popular. Whites would have a better chance of surviving if they could start with a clean slate, provided enough whites still remained to build on the ruins.

In political geography smallness is not necessarily a handicap or a sign of weakness. A small, preponderantly Euro-American state cut out of the dying husk of America would be a step forward, not a step backward, in statecraft. The separatism already rampant in the late 20th-century United States would make the task of forming ethnostates much easier. The Negroization and Hispanicizing of some of the largest American cities have aided and abetted white flight to the suburbs. The population shifts have not gone unnoticed by the two major political parties. As the trend continues and race, despite laws and regulations to the contrary, becomes the crucial determinant of living space, whites will be more reluctant than ever to associate with nonwhites. The condition of the inner cities is such that no promises or bribes from an integrationist government would be sufficient to persuade white families, particularly those that managed to escape, to move there.

The free riders of civilizations, the worshippers of materialism, the liberal and conservative stick-in-the-muds, the religious hierarchs, the fanatic defenders of the status quo, the rich who fear that change, any change, will upset their golden applecarts—all such creatures will strongly oppose any serious step towards activating the ethnostate solution. Their primary tactic will be to accuse ethnostate proponents of deliberately and maliciously trying to destroy "a great country with a great history" for a variety of evil purposes.

As mentioned previously, ethnostates will not preclude cer-

tain interregional organizations—in conformity with the thesis that the politics of the future calls for more organization at the bottom, a measure of organization at the top and much less organization in the middle. Nations, nationhood and nationality, since they have outgrown their original meanings, should go the way of chattel slavery and child labor. *Vive la différence* must be the watchword of all those really interested in elevating mankind to a higher, more intelligent and more creative level of social organization.

The economy of the West peaked in the 1980s in an orgy of hedonistic produce and consume. Beholden as ever to the periodic curve, the economy soon ushered in the belt-tightening recession of the early 1990s. Without the racial irritant, the ethnostate would be better able than multiracial states to straighten out the curve. A small homogeneous state, even in the worst of times, is often better equipped to ride out economic booms and busts, if only because its small size makes its economy more flexible, more resilient and more resistant to control by the vast bureaucracies and mountains of regulations of Big Government that prevent or fatally postpone remedial action,

Jefferson was probably right about economic stagnation being a serious threat to liberty. He thought it critically important that in a crisis individuals be in a position to exercise their creative and entrepreneurial powers with minimal governmental interference. He understood that an economy can hardly flourish in a nation constantly at war with its neighbors. It cannot flourish any better in a nation constantly at war with itself.

Trends. For a great part of the world the 20th century has not been an era of peace and plenty. Accordingly, since both fusion and fission pressures are simmering almost everywhere, two powerful political vectors are taking shape. One points backward towards more centralization and authoritarianism, the other forward towards devolution and separatism. It is in step with the latter trend that the concept of the ethnostate assumes greater relevance and immediacy.

As mentioned previously, racial integration in the United States has been countered by white flight to the suburbs and rural areas. Simultaneously, legal and illegal immigrants from Mexico and other parts of Latin America are spreading across the face of the land after taking over large areas of southern California. The Cubanization of south Florida proceeds apace, though there may be some reflux to Cuba when Fidel Castro resigns, dies in bed or goes the way of his brother dictator in Romania. Concurrently, Soviet Jews are arriving by the tens of thousands. In accord with their innate predisposition for urban living, they prefer to settle in New York, Los Angeles and other megalopolitan areas

Only a self-protective, race-minded people could effectively stop this massive influx. Since no powerful anti-immigration party has yet appeared in the United States (or elsewhere in the West with the exception of the National Front in France), the racial composition of most Western countries is destined to further change. It had been thought that an economic downturn in the host countries might slow or reverse the legal and illegal immigrant flow. But to the average "undocumented worker" unemployment in an industrial nation is preferable to a job in his homeland. The standard of living he and his large Hispanic family enjoy while on welfare in California, Texas and Florida offer them little incentive to return to their hovel in Latin America.

It need not be emphasized that these demographic shifts offer many arguments and some opportunities for the establishment of ethnostates. Whether the West's core population groups will have sufficient numbers and sufficient will to found such states against the violent opposition of racial integrationists, "open border" liberals and dedicated egalitarians is problematic. With regard to the United States, the most sensible, peaceful and democratic solution would be the division of the country into an Hispanic state in the Southwest, a Cuban state in south Florida, a black state somewhere in the rural South, and a series of independent Jewish, black and Asian enclaves in the cities and close-in suburbs where these groups comprise sizable elements of the population. Indians would

keep their reservations, which would be combined into ethnostates and placed largely under their control.

In respect to white, non-Jewish ethnostates, the United States has no provinces or city states on the historic European model. It does, however, have regions with historical and cultural traditions—the Deep South, Appalachia, Texas (once an independent republic), New England, the Farm Belt and the Northwest. Both geography and demography would qualify such areas for ethnostatehood. Where the population has become a welter of different ethnic factions in large metropolitan areas, neighborhoods could be the loci for political, economic and social groupings. Though too small to qualify as ethnostates, they would be accorded as much independence as reasonably possible.

Unwary Allies. There are more than a few contemporary political movements nudging the West in the direction of an "ethnostate solution," though the promoters would strenuously deny having any truck whatever with the theme of this book. One such movement, bioregionalism, is the stamping ground of environmental activists, Greens, Earth Firsters and a smattering of far-out liberals and politically interested or disinterested conservationists.

Thirty delegates took part in the first bioregional congress held in Missouri in October 1980, in the course of which they made plans to set up an ecologically balanced community in "Ozarkia." Proposals for other bioregions included: Cascadia in western Washington state, Siskiyou in northern California and Katuah in southern Appalachia. Two hundred delegates representing 80 organizations met in the North American Bioregional Congress held near Kansas City (MO) in 1984. The following is an excerpt from their statement of principles:

> Bioregionalism recognizes, nurtures, sustains and celebrates our local connections with: land; plants and animals; rivers, lakes and oceans; air; families, friends and neighbors; community; native traditions; and systems of production and trade. It is taking the time to learn the possibilities of place. It is a mindfulness of local environment, history and community aspirations that can lead to a future of safe and sustainable life.

Unfortunately, the bioregional movement soon broke up into squabbling factions. In Los Angeles one group held "compost toilet beach parties," filed suit against a score of nations, which possessed or supposedly possessed nuclear weapons, and published something called a "bikeshevik" manifesto. The Ozark Area Community Congress came out for tree rights, animal rights, bacteria rights, even virus rights. The enemy was the "Anglos" of North America who "continue to rape the land," although it was these very Anglos who headed up organizations, such as the Sierra Club, that were doing the most to protect the environment. Other bioregional splinter groups dabbled in feminism, Marxism and terrorism. The latter spiked trees, blocked the entrance to cobalt mines and created general mayhem throughout large areas of the West. One faction lauded the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua for its agricultural policies.

Bioregionalists have deliberately avoided the racial factor in their plans and projects. Ecological balance can hardly be obtained without a balanced population. All too frequently, the bioregional movement has fallen into the hands of rootless intellectuals who are the least fit of all persons to establish bioregions, where roots are of paramount importance.

Allan Carlson, the editor of *Persuasion at Work,* a publication put out by the Rockford Institute, writes:

> [T]rue communities are rooted in a self-sacrificing *love* of soil, family, and tradition, and in the individual's willingness to serve as an exemplar and defender of these. In contrast, bioregionalist "loyalties" have more to do with hate than love....Intense hatred for others spills over into self-hate, which simply put, does not inspire sacrifice and cannot sustain community action over time.

There has been some meaningful political activity in Europe on behalf of various aspects of bioregionalism, mainly by Green Parties, who have seats in the parliaments of several European countries. But most Greens, like most American bioregionalists, are more interested in talk than action. They constantly theorize about saving the environment while evincing varying degrees of affection for erstwhile Marxist governments that have probably done more lasting damage to nature's kingdom (Chernobyl, soft coal mining and ancient

factories that eruct more pollution than products) than all the industrial nations of the West put together.

Bioregionalism relies on geography and nature, not race, to determine the location, size and shape of a state. Those areas of the earth's surface which have similar weather, terrain, flora and fauna should, in the bioregionists' view, be detached from huge, unwieldy nation states and reorganized into separate and independent political units.

The founding father of bioregionalism is Swiss biologist Raymond Dasmann, whose monograph, published in 1973 by the Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources in Morges, Switzerland, defined bioregions as ecologically uniform areas where the native species of plants and animals vary by no more than 20%. In bioregions, Dasmann wrote, people find a "sense of identity and peace" and learn "to recognize flora and fauna, to respond to its climatic regime, to become familiar with its limits."

Picking up on Dasmann, poet Allen Van Newkirk founded the Institute for Bioregional Research in Nova Scotia and dedicated it to the reconstruction of "wild areas" that had been "deformed," as he described it, by "culture." To achieve his objective, he advocated the use of language, poetry and myth "as tools of bioregional cognition of the Indo-European, Amerindian and other traditions."

One of the more prominent spokesmen for bioregionalism is Kirkpatrick Sale, a strident Luddite who deplores science and wants us all to return to the bosom of the Earth Goddess Gaea. The following is taken from his article in the Summer 1983 issue of *The Green Revolution*:

> A bioregion is part of the earth's surface where there is a more-or-less distinct geographical, biological, horticultural and climatic identity, from which the human inhabitants have developed a more-or-less distinct economic, social and cultural identity. A watershed or river basin is perhaps the most obvious type of bioregion, though there can be many others—a valley, say, or a desert, or a plateau. The borders between them are usually not rigid...but the regions themselves are not hard to identify, when once we pay attention to Nature's patterns rather than those of some government. The bioregions, then, are Nature's givens, the ecological truths of our earth. It would behoove us to pay more attention to them, and soon. As to how we pay attention, that takes us to self-sufficiency....There is not a single bioregion in this

> country that would not, if it looked to all its resources, be able to provide its own abundant food, its own energy, its own shelter and clothing, its own health and medical care, its own arts and manufactures and industries...and where this or that material or resource may be missing, it is not long before human ingenuity is able to contrive a substitute....If necessity is the mother of invention, then self-sufficiency is its grandmother.

Sale asks the question whether it is right "for New York City to import 29,000 tons of broccoli a year from California when it could just [as] easily get that amount of broccoli from its own bioregion." He wonders whether it is not madness "for Manhattan to be totally dependent on the Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys," 2,600 miles to the west, "for almost all its vegetables and much of its fruit." He lists the costs of this cross-country supply line: the huge annual expenditures for fossil fuels, the heavy toll on the overloaded highway system, the increased pollution and congestion, and finally the decline in nutritional quality owing to the large amounts of chemical preservatives needed to keep food "fresh" during shipment.

In New York and New Jersey, Sale continues, farmers "are squeezed out of business, their lands sold and turned into shopping malls and condominiums." People continue to crowd into megalopolitan anthills, as vast expanses of rural America become increasingly impoverished. Agribusiness rips up the countryside, he solemnly intones, and rips off the public. The topsoil and water resources are depleted and exhausted. Pesticides and fertilizers pose health risks to both grower and consumer.

It is true, Sale admits, that self-sufficiency demands "some extra work" and "may require some change in eating habits (though only in the direction of fresher, more nutritional, more healthful foods)." It is also true that an autarkic economy means "giving up certain imports (though almost any that are truly valuable can be produced locally or substituted for in one way or another)."

According to Sale, "a self-starting bioregion is. . .more stable, it has more control over its economy, it is not at the mercy of boom-and-bust cycles." It is not another country's economic vassal.

> It is able to plan, to allocate its resources, to develop what it wants to develop at the safest pace in the most ecological manner....[I]t is of necessity a more cohesive, more self-regarding, self-concerned spot of earth, with a sense of place, of comradeship, of community, with the kind of character that is built on stability, pride, competence, control and independence.

In his summary Sale asserts that a self-contained bioregion brings out the best in people because it forces them to rely on their own devices, to depend on what is local and at hand, not on commodities and energy sources from some remote country whose emir can double or triple prices by merely issuing a ukase. Self-reliant individuals "had best be able to cook and sew and harvest and chop wood and build and repair," so they can become Jacks and Jills of all trades. Rather than simplify, bioregionalists will have "to complexify" in order to ward off the many dangers posed by monopoly and monotony. One of the most overlooked dangers is the economy of scale, which limits "factories to a single product, people to a single job, jobs to a single motion, motions to a single purpose."

Man has climbed to the top of the evolutionary heap, in Sale's opinion, precisely because of his capacity for diversification. Human organizations are most productive and dynamic when they are capable of responding to all sorts of challenges. They "become brittle and unadaptable" when robotized and specialized. When men and women are able "to take on many jobs, learn many skills, live many roles," they reach their full potential. A bioregion that "develops a multiplicity of ways of caring for itself. . .becomes textured and enriched."

There is more than a hint of Rousseau's "Noble Savage" in Sale's utopia. In one flight of fancy, he suggests that the American Indians should be his strongest supporters. Playing the politically correct game, he never utters a syllable about race. Though the success of any bioregion would depend primarily on the capabilities and talents of its inhabitants, Sale, bowing low to the prevailing taboo, carefully omits mentioning the biological aspects and requirements of his proposed social order. Instead, he resorts to some heavy thinking about ecodynamism, empowerment and an "integrated state of maturity."

Another proponent of ideas that harmonize to some degree

with the ethnostate is the previously mentioned E.F. Schumacher, whose blistering attacks on huge, uncontrollable nation states and appeals for reducing them to a governable size provide a strong endorsement for the politics of fission. Like Sale, however, Schumacher scrupulously avoids the subject of race in his plea for political, economic and social devolution.

Schumacher, a prominent British economist, goes well beyond considering his field of expertise to be the "dismal science." He treats it as a "dirty science" that in its present state places far too much emphasis on mass production, profit, growth and economies of scale—all to the great detriment of the environment. He advocates introducing moral and psychological factors into economics to balance its top-heavy materialism. Big corporations should be broken up into semi-independent units. Small businesses should be helped and encouraged. Every effort should be made to provide useful work to every adult.

Claiming that only 3.5% of the earth's inhabitants actually produce anything and that only one-third do any work at all, Schumacher proposes increasing the proportion of producers to at least 20% of the work force. Better to have millions working with their own tools and hands than to have robots and computers putting vast numbers of people out of work. To bring off this economic revolution successfully some central planning would be needed, much to the dismay of free-market enthusiasts, who are against state planning *per se* and would never agree that a planned economy can operate more efficiently and effectively in a small state than in a large one. Factoring morality and environment into economic programs would be a much easier task in small countries, where the radical changes Schumacher suggests could be more closely monitored.

Schumacher condemns capitalism for thriving on greed. He is against socialism for its tendency to develop massive, inhuman bureaucracies. What he would like to see, at least in the Third World, would be two million villages inhabited by two billion villagers. He decries the spread of urbanization, the

ever-declining number of small farms, and the takeover of agriculture by agribusiness with its soil-destroying and poisonous pesticides. He would place a cap of half a million on the population of cities.

In many ways Schumacher can be classified as a reactionary. He rails against nuclear energy, space exploration and practically all scientific and technological work that does not promote some aspect of humanitarianism. He deplores the Faustian spirit, which has lifted man above all other animals, sent him off on fantastic missions to the edge of the solar system, and may one day take him to the edge of the universe.

Schumacher is right about technology and science needing a more human face, but he is dead wrong if it must be achieved at the cost of padlocking our laboratories and returning to a bucolic existence. There is a fire in man that simply will not be extinguished. Because it occasionally flames out of control and does some damage is no reason for snuffing it out.

Much of what dismays Schumacher is the ability of the West to impress its values on the Third World. Although he would probably be loath to admit it, the ethnostate, which favors the implosion not the explosion of culture and prefers cultural separation to cultural integration, would be a giant step towards realizing many of his ideas.

Leopold Kohr, whose devolutionary proposals for European nations have already been briefly noted, has proposed some specific limitations on area and population to bring about what he calls the "optimum state." In his scholarly book, *The Overdeveloped Nations*, he writes that Plato's ideal city state had a population of 5,040 and that Thomas More populated his utopian municipality with 6,000 families. Kohr's own proposed communities would have between 7,000 to 12,000 people, enough to provide the basic amenities. For cultural amenities—theaters, art galleries, museums, churches, universities—the population should range from 50,000 to 200,000. The renowned city states of ancient Greece and renaissance Italy, he informs us, rarely had more than 200,000 inhabitants.

Politics, Kohr writes, gets out of hand when the population goes much over the 200,000 mark. He warns that the normal

functions of government will break down completely if the population of a city exceeds 12 to 15 million. Kohr pays particular attention to Aristotle's brilliant comments on the effect of size on human endeavors. No matter how strong the state, unbraked growth will constantly eat at its foundations.

Kohr believes that size, when applied to states, has four components: number, density, integration and velocity. All else being equal, a closely packed population is "larger" than the same number of people spread over a wide area. A state consisting of several distinct population groups with different racial and cultural backgrounds will be less "dense" than a homogeneous state of the same size. A state with a bound-to-the-soil farm population with poor transportation will have less velocity and thus be classified as "smaller" than an industrialized, high-tech state with heavy commuter traffic, even if the populations of both states are equal in number

According to Kohr, the reason some vast, overextended empires remained viable so long, despite their size, was their policy of decentralization. Power to the provinces, which became in effect independent states, was the policy of the later Roman Empire. The strength of the United States is or was its emphasis on federation. If Kohr is right, the usurpation of states' rights by the Presidency, Congress and the Supreme Court is the tocsin that tolls America's death knell.

Kohr points out that Britain, shorn of empire, is a richer and more successful state, at least when measured by the living standards of its citizens. Another reason for its present stability and prosperity is Parliament's recognition of the nationalist feelings of the Welsh and the Scots. In the 1959 British general elections 80,000 Welsh voted for Plaid Cymru, the party that demands complete independence for Wales.

If Kohr's theories are even partially valid, any oversized nation is doomed, especially if it is oversized in all of Kohr's four categories. The Soviet Union fell apart since it exceeded Kohr's population limits, density and centralization. Only the U.S.S.R.'s velocity component remained within acceptable bounds. In Kohr's opinion the fragmentation of the United States will not lag far behind the disintegration of the Soviet

Union. This means that for Americans the ethnostate solution moves further into the realm of possibility—and necessity—with every passing day.

Let us put aside for the moment the objection that the regrouping of population groups of similar genetic and cultural background into ethnostates would involve such an extensive loss of property and result in so much violence that the fiercest opponents to this revolutionary or, more accurately, this evolutionary step would be the white majorities. Let us admit that even under the most favorable conditions any ethnostates carved out of the United States would face immense difficulties. The author concedes all these objections have some validity, but wishes to point out that the ideas being floated here are not concerned with the present but with the future, not with conditions as they exist today or tomorrow, but with those that will exist the day after tomorrow, when Americans—and perhaps Europeans—will have reached the point where they will have to choose between ethnostates or no states at all.

Chapter 2

The Mortality of Culture

Races are organisms with limited life spans. Cultures can be viewed as organisms, the existence and duration of which often seems synchronized with the life span of a particular race, tribe or population group. When a culture changes, as it does when outsiders take possession of it, it dies in the sense that it loses most of its original content. It may leave behind some residues, just as a father leaves behind some of his genes to his children. But the child is never the same as the father, and the successor culture is never the same as the culture that preceded it.

Organisms expire from many causes—old age, disease, accident, even from despair. The causes of cultural death are not too dissimilar. A culture grows repetitive, stodgy and senile, as an aging human does. It may be corrupted and perverted when in full flower. Unforeseen historical happenstances can kill a culture as efficiently as a head-on collision with another automobile can wipe out a family on a Sunday drive. The wrong military alliance at the wrong time, a drastic change in the weather, the depletion of critical resources—any of these factors or all working together can mortally wound a culture.

Tradition is the atmosphere in which culture breeds and breathes. Never to be discounted is the cumulative effect of cultural aggression carried on by outsiders who pose as insiders. In such cases tradition is no longer a shield but a punching bag.

Man, a partner of nature, cooperates with nature to produce

the phenomenon of culture. To say that culture is separate from man or independent of man is to say that atoms have no connection with their molecules. Human life adapts to a particular environment and in the process produces a particular type of man. There is no dividing or compartmentalizing the process. Once man settles in a specific environment he may remain longer than the environment itself, which when largely man-made, can change faster than man, in some cases faster than man can catch up with it.

The hereditarian puts too much emphasis, not on the importance of inheritance, but on man in general, as if man was a thing apart. Gung ho environmentalists commit a grave sin by giving man's biological component only a fraction of the importance and influence accorded to culture and nature. Yet man, as has already been pointed out, is a part of nature and at the same time the key component of culture.

Nurturists will surely comprise some of the bitterest opponents of the ethnostate, which calls for biological restructuring to precede cultural restructuring. A state based on racial and cultural similarity can have little appeal to those who consider race a stumbling block and culture a self-generated construct that springs fully grown and ramified, like Athena from the forehead of Zeus.

The ethnostate offers no false dawns, no airy promises that groups from less complex cultures, when brought into contact with more complex ones, will acquire in a decade or two what it took another breed of humans centuries to develop. It is both unhealthy and impractical for a culture to borrow from another what it could not create under its own power. The less articulated culture then assumes a burden it is incapable of carrying. Sooner or later, cultural accretions are likely to be rejected, just as the transplant recipient may reject a new heart or kidney.

Is there some kind of biological pulse, some kind of pulmonary rhythm at work in races which causes them to have slower heartbeats and to breathe more slowly than their human components? As he ages, the individual becomes ever more aware of death which, when it overtakes him, becomes a matter

of public record. No one ever really knows exactly when a culture dies. Unawareness of death, even at the moment it strikes, makes it difficult to date a culture's life span.

The Question of Art and Non-Art. What is the sense of telling someone a story if the listener cannot understand what he is being told? If art, a form of communication, fails to communicate, it fails in its main purpose. The only ones who "understand" the incomprehensible work of modern artists are their agents, a few rootless dilettantes and some speculators. An unknown artist whose output suddenly becomes all the rage is a money tree, not to mention the tax deductions accumulated by his patrons when his "art" is donated to a museum at highly inflated values.

As to more mundane levels of communication, such as speech, it is easier to speak to a small crowd than a large one, easier to speak to people like yourself than to foreigners. Men and women who speak the same language do not have to have their words interrupted by passing them through the filter of translation. Those who live in a state populated by their own kind are not bombarded by the confusing and often contradictory messages that are the *lingua franca* of multiracial states. The inhabitants of an ethnostate are much less apt to be assaulted or outraged by art foisted upon them by racial and cultural oddballs motivated to alienate rather than to please the artistic sensibilities of the host population.

Art flourishes when it both reaches up and reaches down. It is a collective enterprise in which the artist's mission is to satisfy and fulfill his people's artistic needs. The biological link reinforces the artistic urge and raises it to a higher plane than could be attained by a writer, painter or composer working in an alien environment in complete isolation from his people. Artificial fame and substantial financial rewards may indicate that someone is an artist, but in the long run it is his art and his art alone which gives him authenticity. His own people and no other people—not himself, not his publicist, no alien or androgynous critic—will be the final judge. When his own people do not understand him, no one will. Lack of

understanding and incomprehension on the part of his "natural audience" transforms what the artist conceives to be art into non-art.

If the Athenian population in the 5th century B.C. had not resonated to the plays of Sophocles, there would have been no Sophocles, or at least the Greeks and those who came after them would never have attended a Sophoclean play. Today, the level of public understanding is so low, the artistic sensibilities of the public so stunted, that about all that is left of drama is its lowest common denominator, the commercial-loaded television sitcom. Like a telephone conversation, art is a two-way communication. When the line is cut, there is no connection.

The ethnostate will give art a lift by providing it with a homogeneous audience. The artist will now know with whom he is dealing. He will no longer have to dilute, vulgarize, simplify or sensationalize his work to make it more intelligible and palatable to a culturally and racially diverse audience. The ethnostate will give him true artistic freedom, since he will escape the censorship that suffocates creativity in a multiracial state, where the artist is at the mercy of an army of differently attuned critics, ready and eager to pounce on him for lacking "sensitivity" towards one or another population group, and ready and eager to denounce him for the slightest manifestation of his own ethnic pride. These same critics, it might be added, are usually quite supportive of ethnic pride, provided it is restricted to their own population group.

The art that counts is the art that gives people a spirited and spiritual boost. In a multiracial, pluralistic state, art is reduced to meaningless pap—ever larger doses of obscenity in plays and literature, whose purpose is to shock, not uplift, ever louder drumbeats in music and ever more tasteless daubs on canvas.

Modern artists often appear to be more interested in posing and posturing as artists than in art itself. They seem locked into the habit of encumbering their painting, sculpture, music and literature with excerpts from political statements and campaign speeches. Some of the richest, most successful and

most influential of these "artists" may actually lack a genetic capacity for art. Jewish artists are descended from a people whose orthodox sects have observed millennia-old religious strictures against graven images. Those other Semites, the Arabs, have compensated for their religiously ordained prohibition against painting the human figure by developing graceful and artistic lettering and some beautiful architecture.

In addition to the era of high art in ancient Greece, there were moments in Renaissance Florence, Elizabethan England and Goethe's Weimar when the artistic tastes of the cultivated classes and the people were almost in tune, when theater audiences were on an equal footing of cultural sophistication with the playwright. Such rare explosions of genius may provide a foretaste of the high art that should emerge from ethnostates.

In multiracial states art, especially popular art, inevitably becomes regionalized. The most important American painters in the 20th century are the Midwest regionalists, Grant Wood, Thomas Benton and Edward Hopper. The most "listened to" music was and is the country music of the South, the hit tunes of Broadway and Hollywood, and the Negro jazz that originated in the saloons of New Orleans, Memphis and Chicago. The most significant literature was produced in the South (William Faulkner and Thomas Wolfe) and the Midwest (Ernest Hemingway and F. Scott Fitzgerald). Art in America no longer springs from the country at large and from the people at large.

For want of a better definition, art is subtlety. It is not a proper medium for propaganda. Today, Westerners are often forced to adopt a form of reverse racism as a defense against artists who skillfully mount racist attacks against them. Everyone is so obsessed with racism these days there is little time for anything else, least of all art, unless the art directly serves a racial agenda.

Times of change are marked by the dying and birthing of races and cultures. Dying is often one long process of spiritual and bodily degeneration, which translates into degenerate art. Birthing is a synonym for immaturity, inexperience and lack

of control. But whereas the youngster grows into an adult, the oldster looks only towards the grave. Out of the warm, self-centeredness of young civilizations can evolve the cool assurance, sophistication, depth and control that are the building blocks of high culture.

If one or more of the West's minorities should prove to be the inheritors of the future, no genuine art will emerge until they free themselves from the cultural legacies of the majorities they have overcome. Miscegenation with the remnants of once dominant majorities will simply speed up the minorities' own degeneration. History proves again and again that high art is the product of homogeneity. When heterogeneous elements flow in to partake of the material comforts of the high civilization that go hand in hand with high culture, the art curve slopes downward.

Art critic Joseph Wood Krutch has written, "The only dangerous threat to an established morality is a new morality." He is both right and wrong. An alien morality imposed on a declining native morality may produce a hybrid morality that degenerates into immorality. Without morality, art quickly decends into pornography.

One of popular art's most nagging questions is: How far can it be divorced from reality? In late 20th-century art, role reversal has almost become an inviolable rule. Negroes commit crimes hugely disproportionate to their numbers, but in order not to exacerbate racial feelings and in an effort to blur the gruesome statistics of black crime, films and plays constantly feature black "good guys" and white "bad guys." In TV sitcoms, producers and writers go out of their way to have the Negro grade-school student, who in real life has a lamentable scholastic record, answer a teacher's question correctly almost before the white student can raise his hand. The psychological effect of this deception on white students is difficult to assess. One thing is certain. At an early age white children are subject to a barrage of songs, cartoons and TV shows about race which they soon learn from first-hand experience to be false. To know that popular art is a medium for deception creates suspicions about all art, even great art.

Forced Acculturation. Though military aggression is the most serious form of foreign interference into matters of state, cultural aggression comes in a close second. Adverse reactions are to be expected whenever and wherever any population group is persuaded or forced to adopt the customs and manners of another population group by economic and political pressure or by some other intrusive means, such as being co-opted into the population of the aggressor by marriage or less lawful forms of interbreeding. Despite all the approval lavished these days on the notion of cultural diffusion, what really happens to an indigenous culture under attack is similar to what an individual exposed to a disease-carrying virus undergoes.

Aside from preventing people from living according to their predilections, cultural aggression brings in its wake other more subtle and less apparent evils. Different population groups have varied aesthetic and psychological tolerances. Who would deny that jazz has not made unhealthy inroads in cultures whose music, particularly folk music, differs so radically from that of the Negro? In earlier times, when the tables were turned, were not the musical talents of slaves distorted when they heard the unsyncopated rhythms and melodies of their Southern masters? For centuries Western culture has had an almost irresistible attraction for Asians and black Africans. Tens, if not hundreds, of millions of nonwhites have adopted Western ways to the disdain and despair of other hundreds of millions of their kin who have remained loyal to their native customs.

Cultural aggression, which may precede or follow military aggression, fills the great reservoir of human disagreement to overflowing. It would be greatly curbed, if not eliminated, in a world of ethnostates, since each separate population group would be encouraged, indeed practically compelled, to keep its culture at home. Every ethnostate's culture would be self-embargoed and labeled "not for export."

The cultures of some population groups, depending on the time and place, are often too delicate to endure too many severe shocks, either external or internal. Conversely, some cultures are often tough enough to outlast military occupation

and long periods of persecution by what would seem to be more dynamic cultures.

Perhaps the second worst crime in mankind's book, after genocide, is culturecide. In the present-day West, crime, joblessness and economic jolts are less dangerous and threatening than the counterculture of drugs, homosexuality, heavy metal cacophony, decadent liberalism, pornography and minority paranoia—a counterculture that is not seeking to modify or change the culture it is attacking, but to erase it.

Countercultures are quasi-cultures. At bottom they are anarchistic and destructive reactions to the discipline, responsibility and concentrated effort needed to keep any culture viable. Although it is often a severe mental and physical strain for people of rudimentary cultures to live up to the standards of high cultures, it is just as much of a task for the possessors of highly articulated cultures to defend their precious possession against the incessant assaults of countercultures.

Members of the same race have little difficulty adapting to the different cultures of other members, since race is an important determinant of culture and the cultures developed by members of the same race are not all that disparate. Non-English-speaking Northern Europeans easily and quickly adapted to the Anglo-Saxon core culture of Australia, New Zealand, British Canada and the United States.

To evolve, culture needs constant challenges, but they should come from within, not from without. A culture torn and frazzled by interracial conflicts is hobbled by the amount of energy it must waste asserting and proving its own worth and uniqueness. Only a culture that is sure of itself, that has the freedom and resources to work towards perfecting itself, without excessive internal and external interference, can attain the heights to which it aspires. When asking about a particular culture, a better question than where it comes from is where it is going. One of the great problems of culture is how to preserve it without petrifying it.

Aesthetics. If there are absolute standards of beauty, then some races or population groups, because they have a greater

concentration of the physical traits that conform to these standards, would have to be judged more attractive than others. In a multiracial state this preponderance of attractiveness in the genetic makeup of one or more groups is a constant thorn in the side of those who possess fewer of these "premium" traits. Over time, aesthetically ruffled feelings do little for political and social harmony.

By keeping different racial and ethnic groups geographically apart, the envy and animosity engendered in the population groups considered less attractive will be sharply reduced, if not altogether eliminated. Living entirely with their own kind, the citizens of ethnostates will not be reminded on a daily basis of their also-ran status in world beauty pageants. Nor will TV commercials, newspaper ads and billboard posters overawe them with the faces and physiques of members of more handsome population groups.

If beauty standards are not absolute, if they are determined by the dominant population group in any society, as Marxists and equalitarians tell us, racial separation provides a better solution to the problem than waiting for a jealous subject race to rise up, overpower the ruling establishment and set its own standards of beauty.

The quick way out of such an aesthetic impasse is to have population groups define their own ideals of beauty without the interference and presence of other groups. Physical attractiveness would be measured by internal comparisons, not by invidious comparisons with other races.

There is some truth to the equation that art plus genetics equals aesthetics. Art is a transcendent experience fixed in paint, stone, words and musical notes. When Christ was painted, sculpted or otherwise described as a Middle Easterner, Christianity had difficulty catching fire in Northern European hearts. To conform to the Nordic view of Christianity even Lucifer was often depicted with a fair complexion. How else could he have so successfully tempted people with light hair, light skin and light eyes? Ugliness in the eye of the beholder does not tempt.

In a world of ethnostates, let the racial stereotypes flourish,

but let them be restricted to the homogeneous population groups of each ethnostate and not flow across borders, where they proceed to stir up the racial mischief that has been so damaging to multiracial states.

Cultural diversity contains an aesthetic component that may have a profound effect on the collective subconscious. Consider the United States. A century and a half ago it was divided into fairly well-defined regions: the Deep South, the dry, semi-desert, cattle-breeding Southwest, Puritan New England, the farm country of the Midwest. Today, Dubuque is scarcely different from Orlando; Portland, Oregon, from Portland, Maine. The same billboards, shopping malls, TV programs, gasoline stations and fast food restaurants are omnipresent in modern America's 3,618,770 square miles of dreary sameness.

By a twin process of concentration and isolation, ethnostates would first resist then reverse this lemming-like rush to overall conformity. The all but extinct regionalism of America would be reborn and refurbished, as would the provinces of Europe, though many of the latter still retain remnants of their original character.

Of the notable cultural benefits the ethnostate would bestow on mankind, perhaps the greatest would accrue to the eye, which would light up when by merely crossing the nearest frontier the traveler comes face to face with a different way of life, a distinct set of customs, a different art and architecture. Tourism, which has now deteriorated into driving or flying from sameness to sameness, would revert to its higher purpose: inspiring the serious traveler to learn more about himself by comparing his ways to the ways of strangers. At the same time tourism for the sake of tourism, purely for the sake of traveling, should be limited. Too many such tourists tend to destroy the uniqueness of the places they visit. Too many cultural intruders distort native cultures. For this reason ethnostatists, while developing a modern and efficient domestic transportation network, should not go overboard in promoting foreign travel and should do what they can to protect other ethnostates as well as their own from mass incursions of sightseeing Philistines. In the words of Robert Frost, who borrowed with

acknowledgment an aphorism that appeared in an 1850 South Carolina almanac, "Good fences make good neighbors."

Chapter 3

Diversity Contra Pluralism

Those who preach diversity and pluralism in the same breath may think they are playing around with synonyms, but they are really mixing oil and water. A motley mass of diverse population groups stirred together in an urban or suburban stew inevitably leads to miscegenation, which in turn leads to biological and cultural conformity and similarity, not diversity. A world divided into ethnostates, all showing a decent respect for each other's distinctiveness by establishing well-marked geographical and well-understood racial and cultural boundaries, is the best bet for preserving and actually increasing diversity, for the cogent reason that it militates against the one certain means of ending diversity, namely, interbreeding and crossculturation. Notwithstanding what is being said or written by politicians and editorial writers, pluralism, which is dedicated to sheltering within its confines a wide variety of races and cultures, can only mean the revival of the outmoded idea of the American Melting Pot, the pot that never has and never will melt its nonwhite components.

Pluralism has now reached scriptural status in the West. Diversity, in the context of pluralism, has also become a political and social commandment. Yet in the long run pluralism leads away *from* rather than *to* diversity. This conceptual confusion offers ethnostatists a rare chance to make an effective inroad into one of the most deeply held and most cherished liberal beliefs. By demonstrating their sincere adherence to the

principle of diversity and carefully explaining that true pluralism can only be achieved outside, not inside, the Melting Pot, ethnostatists, if they play their cards correctly, can tap into some of the vast media resources ever at the disposal of liberalism.

Once it is made plain that pluralism, as presently conceived and practiced, can only result in undifferentiated uniformity, a major prop of the established political theology will be severely shaken. Just as AIDS is a constant reminder of the deadly contradictions in the homosexual way of life, so pluralism can be presented to its adherents as an antonym rather than a synonym of genuine diversity.

Pluralism, it should also be pointed out, is not necessarily synonymous with multiracism. Religious pluralism is a standing threat to social stability even in a monoracial state. Serious and profound disputes have arisen wherever two or more faiths have existed side by side. Some religious wars have been more violent and destructive than racial or class conflicts, though tenuous correlations between religion and class and between religion and race can generally be found. Political and economic pluralism, which divides people into classes, lays the groundwork for revolutions by the less affluent and for counterrevolutions by the more affluent.

Headcounting. A pluralistic state has the tendency to become an arena of competing birthrates. Since the richer elements of the population usually produce fewer children than the poorer elements, the latter will eventually outnumber the former, at which point they begin to challenge the dominant group's leadership. The challenge, if successful, will frequently be accompanied by the persecution, purges and possibly even the liquidation of what was once the ruling elite. One negative means of avoiding these pitfalls is intermarriage, which, though it may temporarily suppress violence, dilutes and distorts the cultures of all population groups—cultures which would thrive in the fertile and protective soil of an ethnostate.

Competitive breeding in an ethnostate is not the problem it is

in pluralistic societies. Homogeneity eliminates a principal cause of interracial baby derbies—the racial minorities' urge for empowerment. Disparate birthrates also affect foreign relations. A state with an exploding population and an eye on a less populated neighboring state may decide it needs more territory. It may also decide its bigger pool of manpower will ensure an easy victory in an aggressive war. This is where international or regional mediation committees should enter the picture. As stated previously in this study, the chief purpose of international bodies should be to keep states from attempting to dominate other states. Competitive breeding is one means, perhaps the most destructive means, of disrupting the peace and stability of countries with low birthrates.

When a high birthrate is a desideratum of government policy in a country that is already overpopulated, it is the responsibility of professional third-party mediators to ensure that the increased numbers do not lead to "cultural imperialism" or other forms of aggression. At present this problem is disappearing in most industrial nations, because fewer and fewer white women want more than two children and tens of millions are satisfied with one. The two-income family puts too much of a work load on mothers for them to engage in long bouts of childbearing. But masses of immigrants, legal and illegal, from Third World countries and the large families favored by unassimilable minorities already domiciled in the West continue to remind Westerners of not only the political and economic but also the cultural dangers posed by high nonwhite birthrates.

Unfortunately, there will always be some white couples, who for religious reasons or out of sheer ignorance, will continue to bring more children than they should into an already overcrowded world. If persuasion will not stop their reckless breeding, then some type of sanctions must be invoked and some form of enforced birth control initiated. Whatever else is done, these irresponsible child-bearers should be given a crash course in demographics, a discipline which has evolved in recent decades from a little-known, esoteric form of head-counting to a full-blown, respectable science that holds a

master key to human progress.

Rethinking Pluralism. Domestic pandering to different ethnic groups at home inescapably panders to their relatives overseas and results in a porous immigration policy. Altruism, liberalism, equalitarianism, minority racism and other modern shibboleths permit the entry of large numbers of foreigners, many of whom are incapable of assimilation. Consequently, the racial composition of the population of the United States and of many Western countries is forever changing. It is no surprise that, when the racial and cultural mix of the population changes, the country changes. With the changes come all the problems that multiracialism loads on the social order.

The 20th century's most pluralistic state was the Soviet Union, the world's largest country in respect to land mass, with a huge variegated population, ranging from Moslem Mongoloids in Central Asia to Nordics in the Baltic states, from Slavic Alpines in Russia proper to Eastern Mediterranean Georgians and Armenians in the Caucausus. Such a potpourri of people could only be held together by force. In the late 1980s, when the U.S.S.R. gave up its satellite states in Eastern Europe and when President Gorbachev triggered the chain reaction of devolution within the Soviet Union, the Soviet empire disintegrated. The centrifuge inherent in pluralism went into overdrive.

Unlike the late U.S.S.R., America is not neatly divided into distinct geographical partitions, each with centuries of racial and cultural homogeneity acting as a hair-trigger for separatism. The South, the one region that did break away and achieve separate nationhood for a few years, bears a few similarities to a European province, but the Republican and Democratic parties will strongly oppose and suppress any meaningful movement towards white separatism, even as racial and cultural borders in the Hispanic Southwest and in the inner cities are hardening. While nonwhite minorities slowly solidify their separatist yearnings, the white majority—forbidden to practice apartness and, in spite of its many internal divisions and ideological schisms, still the racial and cultural core of the

country—will have ever greater difficulty holding everything together.

Partly to counter the anti-assimilationist trends of nonwhite minorities, the American government has resorted to bribery in the form of affirmative action and racial preference programs, measures which obviously anger most whites. When the bribery becomes so costly and so racially divisive as to provoke widespread public disorder, laws will probably be passed to prohibit open debate on the issue, which will increase rather than decrease the desire of some white population groups to quit the union and go it on their own. To the consternation of a majority of Supreme Court justices, laws of this type, purportedly targeted on "hate crimes," already exist in several American states.

Problems of Diversity. There are several schools of thought about diversity. One school believes the promotion of cultural diversity bestows more power and freedom on minorities by encouraging them to resist the cultural dominance of majorities. Another school insists that integration of any kind—political, economic, social or cultural—degrades the character and morale of the minority groups caught up in the acculturation process. Consisting mainly of Jews, still another school, more accurately an organized network, preaches diversity in the belief that it serves as a protective shield in what at any time could turn into a hostile, anti-Semitic environment. Although Jews prefer to attach themselves to the host culture, as they seek to modify and shape it to their own tastes and requirements, these "networkers" stridently promote cultural diversity, not because they think it right, but because it serves their own ends. History has taught them that a pluralistic state has room and breathing space for various ethnic groups, while a monocultural state, except for occasional outbursts of altruism from its intellectuals, will barely tolerate the presence of outsiders unless they are willing to accept second-class citizenship. The networkers have also learned that homogeneous societies are dubious about those who have no readily identifiable culture of their own beyond ties to an oldstyle religion

and a heavily doctored history. These doubts multiply as the networkers step up their tinkering with the host culture.

Only in surroundings compatible with their genes can humans fully concentrate on ascending to the higher reaches of culture. Without appropriate frames even the greatest paintings lose some of their luster and beauty. It is no secret that flowers grow more colorfully and luxuriantly in their native soil.

Family, neighborhood and community combine with genetics and learned behavior to form the human personality. Sheer survival is possible without most of the standard environmental props, as hermits, loners and recluses have proved throughout history. But the individual who has voluntarily given up normal associations with his family and fellow humans is not an ordinary individual. The person who skips haphazardly from place to place like a tumbleweed in the desert wind, who feels no loyalty to anyone or anything, is more often than not a troubled soul, one who in the long term receives much more from the society he abhors or flees than he gives in return. He is hardly the type to make any important contributions to human progress.

Diversity within a state expands the quantity of culture but lowers its quality. Multiracial nations suffer from cultural deprivation because the arts fall into the hands of people of many different origins. Diverse cultural and racial backgrounds carry a heavy baggage of disparate and disjunctive predispositions and prejudices.

How much racial division, how much social antagonism can a nation tolerate and still remain a nation? The past tells us that disorganized majorities can be brought to heel by intelligent, willful minorities. Every creative society has had a core population group with enough power and prestige to make its way of life the cultural model for later arrivals of different backgrounds. Such a society must be united and strong enough to withstand the political and cultural competition that is bound to arise as soon as the newcomers get settled and begin to flex their political and economic muscles. An instinctive group protectiveness in the founders and their descendants will

oppose and try to delay any attempt at cultural accommodation and compromise. Even snobbism and prejudice become partially effective defensive weapons against cultural transformation. In declining cultures, however, snobbism favors what is alien or decadent, and prejudice is defined as the worst of evils.

An ethnostate, because of its monoracial and monocultural structure, will avoid the dangers of submitting its population to the forced acculturation that often accompanies civil strife. A *Kulturkampf* is always possible, as it is in every state, since class differences will always be there to fuel it. But the most dangerous fuel—racial friction—will be absent. Experience teaches us that the most significant and most enduring cultural reforms are those urged by reformers on their own people.

In theory, pluralistic nations permit their variegated population groups to cling to their native cultures. In a contradictory theory (and in the poetry of Emma Lazarus) the United States offered the world's oppressed a haven where they would dissolve in a racial and cultural amalgam that would eradicate human differences. The Melting Pot, as this wild idea was later called by another spurious Jewish equalitarian, Israel Zangwill, was partially successful as long as its ingredients were white Europeans. It failed and continues to fail when nonwhites are thrown into the pot.

Why do multiculturalists oppose a world of diverse states, a world that would cultivate diversity not within states, which is pluralism, but in the form of independent ethnostates dedicated to the augmentation of diversity? First it should be noted that these naysayers are the same people who in multiracial states support minority racism, but are horrified at the slightest manifestation of ethnicity on the part of majorities. Their opposition to the ethnostate concept is probably based on an extension of the same reasoning. They are fearful of majorities and do not wish to give them too much opportunity to engage in serious majoritarian politics. They also know that without the white majorities and with only minorities at the helm, Western multiracial states would soon become Third World states, thereby depriving them of the security and material

comforts which make the industrial nations so attractive.

What it boils down to is that one group of diversifiers lobbies for diversification not so much for diversification itself, but to strengthen the power of minorities *vis-à-vis* majorities. The other group of diversifiers (potential ethnostatists?) advocates interstate rather than intrastate diversification. Their aim is to preserve and strengthen the cultures of all population groups by letting them have their own states, where they can follow their own ways and drop the minority status which dogs them in multiracial nations.

Chapter 4

The Morale Factor

If self-respect is a vital element of a successful and productive life, so is group respect. What is not generally understood is the difficulty of having the former without the latter. It is equally difficult for an individual to have self-respect if he is a member of a disrespected group. The psychology works both ways. If the group is not respected, the self-respect of its members is lowered. At the same time, there can be little or no group respect if its members lack self-respect.

Since ethnostates are concerned with the collectivity of their citizens as well as their individuality, both self-respect and group respect are nurtured. In large multicultural, multiracial nations, where individuals are cast adrift in a turbulent demographic sea, group respect is hard to come by. Group competition, though often frowned upon, constantly reminds large segments of the population of their inferior performance in classrooms and later in their careers. Non-members of groups being unable to bathe in the glow of group esteem, ever increasing numbers of isolates in Western countries suffer from a shortage of self-respect. The inherent lonerism of so many Westerners adds greatly to this "flight from the group," as does the media's incessant campaign against group manifestations of majorities, while similar minority manifestations are applauded.

Self-respect and group respect, two of the most important psychological "fits" for a productive and meaningful life,

should be easier to acquire in an ethnostate than elsewhere. Political scientists might keep this in mind, as might those utopians who are busy designing universal states.

Let us suppose that a college football team from the day it starts training to the last game of the season never hears a word of praise from the coach, the faculty, the student body and sports writers. Let us also suppose that the team members are attacked both as members of a group and as individuals day in and day out on the playing field, in the classroom and in the media. Let us further suppose every opposing team on the football schedule is praised just as highly as the home team is criticized. In such circumstances, it will be a very exceptional home team that manages to win a single game.

Population groups need morale as much as teams do. If you are not permitted to utter or hear one good word about your own people, then no matter how great your capabilities, you will be hard put to overcome the mental and physical paralysis imposed by demoralization. It goes without saying that people will conquer adversity much more effectively if their will and spirit are fortified by group morale.

How do majorities fight demoralization? Blacking out the media is one answer. Missing the nightly news is in itself a morale booster. What is good for majorities is what seldom happens. For reading we should turn to books that were written by Westerners when they were still masters in their own house and were treated with more deference than scorn. Our knowledge of current history—and our current predicament—must not be fed to us by minority-written or minority-influenced bestsellers and by liberal-minority intellectuals. Our understanding of the world should be derived from the books and pamphlets printed and distributed surreptitiously to escape the censorious scissors and legal harassment of the thought police.

The world of ethnostates will be a world of majorities, since no state will have a minority. Minority members, no longer having real or imagined racism to blame for their real or imagined problems, will as majority members be able to concentrate on themselves and their own accomplishments, actual or potential. It will be remarkable how quickly scapegoats will

disappear when the racism that haunts multiracial states disappears.

A Case for Optimism. Pessimism is a vital ingredient of tragedy, which is the highest form of drama and the dominant theme in great literature, art and music. No optimist could possibly have created characters like Oedipus, Lear and Faust. Still, optimism is a major force for great deeds in the real world. Few will struggle to perform heroic feats unless they feel that "the world," their country, their community, their family or themselves will be the better for it. The authentic hero is driven by more than ambition and egotism.

Today, far too many of us are in a pessimistic, sterile mood. To overcome this negative state of mind we should devote more of our thoughts to the mysterious subject of time. Every decade or so geologists tell us that the earth is much older than previously suspected. When we recall that Archbishop Ussher's 4004 B.C. date for the Creation was widely believed a few centuries ago, the latest estimate of eight billion years for the earth's age is quite a backward leap in chronology. Since the various species of man rate a barely visible notch on this scale, the time span of civilized or civilizable man is almost imperceptible. If only 50,000 years or so were needed to move up to Isaac Newton from *Homo neanderthalis*, the imagination reels at what might be accomplished in the billions of years that, barring some cosmic catastrophe, still remain on our evolutionary clock. Accordingly, we have good reason to give credence to the most optimistic of optimistic clichés: "The sky's the limit." No matter how many setbacks man faces, he still has more than enough time—hundreds of millions, if not billions, of years—to rectify the cruelest mistakes and overcome the worst setbacks of his earthly existence. This does not mean that modern man should rely on time alone to save him from himself. As an individual, as a living being at the mercy of a fast-ticking biological clock, he must act quickly or not at all. If he does nothing or not enough and drags the world under with him, his only hope is that, given enough time, what has happened once may happen again; that the West in some

far-off millennium will rise once again; that Nietzsche's Eternal Return, in this case shortened to a billion years or so, may come to the rescue. There is even a soupçon of immortality in such lavish helpings of time. But none of these otherworldly panaceas can compete with the high expectations inherent in the religious promise of life after death.

If evolution made the jump from ape to man in 12 million years—no more than a grain of sand in the geological hourglass—then every human being on earth could perish tomorrow and other primates would still have hundreds of opportunities, hundreds of 12-million-year cycles to get back on the evolutionary track and re-evolve into man. The mutations that once operated so successfully on primates would have almost unlimited opportunities to repeat the process.

Short-term pessimism and long-term optimism would appear to be the proper combination of moods for contemporary Western man. The Westerners who are obsessed with the dismaying dysgeny of the modern world and refuse to consider the time factor and its restorative powers are simply not being realistic. There is a mountain of optimism out there for people who take the long view.

Men and women of European descent who note the decline in their numbers have a right to worry about the future, since numerically most other peoples are either holding their own or increasing. But even here there is room for optimism. Accepting 800 million as the current world population of Europeans, either in their original homelands or overseas, this figure is at least eight times higher than it was half a millennium ago. If a race can octuple itself in five centuries and reduce its size by half in three or four generations, as now looks to be the case, the least that can be said about it is that it has a very flexible birthrate. Such flexibility might enable it to reverse its present decline by increasing its current fertility rate by only 30%.

Europeans seem to go through cycles of massive energy outputs—the Dorian invasion of Greece, the folk wanderings that ended the Roman Empire, the settlement of North America and Australasia, the overrunning of Africa and considerable parts of Asia. Who can say that we have seen the last of

such racial dynamism? But if it is to recur, let all the energy be directed inward towards the conquest of the mind, not the conquest of territory; towards genetic engineering and space exploration, not more affirmative action legislation.

Albert J. Nock, the wise old American political philosopher, once tried to boost the morale of serious reformers, not the professional do-gooders and world-savers, by citing Isaiah (1:9), who referred to a "very small remnant" of good people in the world. Few of us ever meet them. Few of us ever know who they are or how many of them exist. But they are there, and they are always ready to help restore a sick people to health, just as in ancient times, according to the Old Testament, the Hebrew remnant rebuilt their ravaged and scorched Promised Land. Nock's Panglossian view is a tonic to depressed members of white majorities. But it is hardly enough for the people who want immediate and tangible results from their labors.

A more effective and enduring way to lift spirits might go like this: I'm right, so I will go ahead, come what may. If no one listens, so what? I would do what I'm doing even if I knew that my people were finished and didn't have a chance of a comeback. Yes, my ship of state, my West, may be going down, but if she goes, I'm going to make sure that at least one member of the crew is still hoisting sail as she sinks. Say to yourself, if you must, that you are a prisoner of destiny, that you have little or no choice. But also say that since you are locked into the struggle, you may as well make the best of it.

Is it sensible to feel pessimistic about events and situations because you like to think they are beyond your control? You had better think again or they will *be* beyond your control.

We all know what usually occurs when different types of animals are locked up in the same cage. Yet our presidents and legislators, confused and pressured by voting blocs and special interest groups, continue to do what no zookeeper would think of doing to animals—confining different breeds of humans in the human zoos of the big cities. If this dangerous practice is not stopped—and the ethnostate would be a most effective way to stop it—then the entire West may become a killing field.

Altruism at Work. The generation of the 1960s was called the "me" generation. Since in many respects it has acted more altruistically than egotistically, its members could just as accurately be described as the "they" generation—meaning that they have put others first and themselves second. We have only to recall the immense amount of foreign aid that is continually lavished by practically all Western nations on the underdeveloped countries, and on nations with foreign policies hostile to the donors. It is the altruistic instinct of Westerners that makes these financial outpouring possible, though minority pressures and media disinformation help it along.

The Golden Mean has always been an honored Western ethic. But there is no word in English for the national or indeed the personal behavior that lies midway between egotism and altruism, no middle ground between "me" and "them." Apparently, all peoples at one time or another are either inner-directed (egotistic, chauvinistic) or outer-directed (altruistic, charitable). The lack of a word for a behavioristic middle ground in the area of domestic and foreign politics demonstrates that the Golden Mean, despite its celebrity status, has found no honorable place in the science of statecraft.

The model altruistic state is America, which calls itself a liberal democracy and which has developed a habit of going to war not only *against* but also *for* foreign countries and peoples, while giving vast numbers of aliens, millions of whom enter the country unlawfully, the rights and privileges of citizenship after only a few years' residence. The families of the legal and illegal immigrants soon join them, thereby overloading the welfare roles and reducing the amount of financial aid available to the nation's own needy.

Is there any Western nation that stands even close to the dividing line between egotism and altruism, that puts its own interests first, but does not allow either the egotism or altruism of its leaders to run riot? Has any large nation or superpower learned that international meddling, even international giving, often leads not only to foreign but to domestic conflicts and confrontations? The ethnostate would appear to be one means of bringing the eternal egotistic-altruistic pendulum to rest.

Chapter 5

Enlightened Foreign Policy

Proponents of globalism believe the best hope of mankind is a world government to supersede all other governments, one that would establish and institutionalize one political, legal and economic system for all mankind. Whatever human differences exist would be treated as inconsequential. With a little carrot-and-stick shepherding, the entire world would become one community.

It is a noble concept, although it tends to ignore that all previous attempts at international or world government have hardly been successful. The League of Nations, which seemed to stir up rather than diminish conflicts, gave up the ghost at the outbreak of World War II. The peacekeeping record of the United Nations is not much better; witness the bloodbaths in Korea, Vietnam, Cambodia, Tibet, Afghanistan and the Middle East. The United Nations only entered the Korean War because the Soviet member of the Security Council happened to be absent and could not cast his usual veto. Soviet vetoes stymied practically every effort at collective action against Communist and pro-Communist aggressors just as American vetoes and opposition stymied United Nations attempts to curb Israel's persecution and dispossession of the Palestinians. The United Nations tried to remove Saddam Hussein from Kuwait by peaceful means, but President Bush wanted war and he got his way.

One way of ending family bickering is for contentious mem-

bers to move out and live apart. The same advice holds true for the family of nations.

Corralling many or all of the earth's peoples into a world government may furnish them a stage instead of a battlefield to air their disputes. But it seldom settles them. Keeping population groups apart and separate sharply diminishes the possibility for disputes to arise. The safest guarantee of world order is to do what referees do in boxing matches. Whenever they want to stop the slugging, they separate the fighters.

There are, of course, some situations and problems that demand international or regional control and regulation—among them overpopulation and matters affecting the environment. But regional, continental or global bodies that try to interfere with the purely domestic issues of a country often do more harm than good.

Different cultures have different moral standards. As long as these standards are not extended by force or undue persuasion beyond the borders of the state that is home to them, they should not be a cause of concern to other states.

Universal empires are seedbeds of violence because they bring different peoples together and often force them to abandon their own habits and customs, and mimic the behavior of their new masters. This form of oppression, even when conducted with velvet gloves, instigates smoldering hatreds and feuds that are seldom extinguished until the alien yoke—military, economic or cultural—is removed.

Globalists, consciously or subconsciously, aim at the reduction of all mankind to a common denominator, thereby directly or indirectly pressuring billions of people to conform to ways of life that are not their own. In the long run this process may work to the detriment of the pressurizers. In order to "keep things under control," the rulers slowly adopt the behavior patterns of the ruled. So, while the cultural imperialism inherent in globalism reaches down to alter the culture of those at the bottom of the power curve, the increasing presence of the latter reaches up to modify the "universal" culture of the One Worlders. As a result, the cultural evolution of everyone is often slowed, if not permanently disrupted.

Some of the more fanatic globalists are convinced that one constitution, one set of laws and one matrix of values should apply to all. They admit there are cultural differences, but warn that paying too much heed to them leads to the abandonment of "humanistic norms." In one sense this arrogant attitude tends to reverse the old adage, "Let those who desire peace prepare for war." The internationalists, who only desire peace on their own terms, are not averse to the use of force to achieve their goal, even though flourishing and unique cultures are destroyed in the process, and the planetary mosaic may lose more of its dwindling tesserae.

When outsiders force any population group to give up, change or modify its mores, the seeds of perpetual discord are sown. Wars have been fought for a multitude of reasons, one of the most important being the desire of people to conduct their own affairs, to worship their own gods and walk in the ways of their fathers and forefathers. To deny these basic rights to any population group is tantamount to a direct assault on its members privacy, which is often their most precious possession.

But this is not to say that the word "international" will disappear from the dictionary with the advent of worldwide devolution. There will still be international organizations. What will be heard much less frequently are the words "national" and "nationalism" as the number of nations diminish. In contrast to the goal of the United Nations, however, which is to keep the peace by bringing people together, the chief purpose of future global bodies will be to guard the independence and sovereignty of ethnostates. Ecology and environmental problems will demand various agreements between two or more states, as will foreign trade, which should be kept to a minimum, notwithstanding that ethnostates with limited resources will need help from abroad until they are able to put in place autonomous or semi-autonomous economies. Some ethnostates, of course, will always need certain minerals and agricultural products possessed by other ethnostates more favorably endowed by nature.

Globalism, No! Unfortunately for both Jews and non-Jews, Jewish organizations will probably be in the forefront of opposition to what is being proposed in this book, although Israel, or rather the vision of a future Israel in the eyes of many Zionists, comes quite close to fitting the description of an ethnostate. So far, the Jewish state has depended and continues to depend on Western, mainly American and German, financial aid for its survival. Without the annual billions of dollars of public and private grants and loans, the Israelis' relatively high standard of living would fall drastically. Since ethnostates are against foreign aid in principle and since Israel has a vital interest in delaying or preventing any development that might endanger the subsidies which are its economic lifeblood, the Zionist state would have to reshape its economy drastically before it could qualify for ethnostatehood.

Many foreign nations, especially those with founded or unfounded fears of Western cultural and financial imperialism, would welcome the division of the West into ethnostates. The establishment of smaller political entities would tend to weaken Western economic predominance by watering down the economies of scale. Latin American states would eagerly applaud what they would perceive as a dismemberment of gringoism.

Small Western nations like Belgium, Holland and the Scandinavian countries would be happy to see the big powers cut down to size by their division into smaller units. Since most black African nations are synthetic political constructs sitting uneasily on top of centuries-old tribalism, they might try to mimic rather than oppose the devolution of Western economic powerhouses.

One of the beneficial consequences of breaking up nations into ethnostates would be a healthy narrowing of what might be characterized as political vision. Since they have no strong cultural core, multicultural states develop bloodless and abstract philosophies of government. Events that happen anywhere are often viewed in the same light as events that happen next door. Few allowances are made for different behavior patterns. If any state deviates from some arbitrary universal moral norm, then its sinful deviations must be punished by a break in

diplomatic relations, a hostile media campaign, economic sanctions, even military measures.

In contrast to small countries, which encourage or should encourage their citizens to think small, big countries encourage their citizens to think big, to worry more about what is happening abroad than at home. The more attention large nations devote to other countries, the less attention they will devote to their own problems. Problem-solving should extend from the individual to the community, not the other way around. Jesus spelled it out quite nicely (Matthew 7: 2-3), but most Western politicians, if they have not forgotten his words, certainly do not heed them: "Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam and mote of thine own eye." (For a brilliant rundown on the dangers provoked by America's "ideological fixation" on foreign policy, see *The Roots of the Modern American Empire* and *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy* by William Apperson Williams.)

Most, if not all, multiracial nations are populated by ethnic groups which have real or imagined genetic and cultural ties with majorities or minorities in other nations. These biological or psychological links can cause severe distortions in foreign policy. The population groups in one country want, often demand and frequently get special treatment for the nations for whom they feel a special kinship. As a result, the interest of the nation as a whole often takes second place to the interests of racial and cultural lobbies, which secure special trade advantages and financial aid for the governments they favor, while the nations they disfavor are punished with economic sanctions. In the worst case, this racial and cultural lobbying can lead a multiracial nation into a senseless war.

Foreign policy disputes will be greatly reduced in ethnostates, since whatever lobbying influences are brought to bear will come from people of the same racial and cultural background. If citizens are asked to put their lives on the line, it will not be to satisfy and mollify minorities and pressure groups.

Just as racial infighting will disappear in a monoracial state, so it ought to disappear in the conduct of foreign affairs. There will, of course, always be differing attitudes towards

foreign policy in an ethnostate, but they will be mostly confined to differing ideas about political and economic systems, much safer subjects than race. If racial motives are involved, at least they will be directed towards shoring up the defenses of a racially and culturally related foreign state. In some ways World Wars I and II could be viewed as civil or intraracial wars: members of Northern European descent (Britons and most Americans) against other people of Northern European descent (Germans). The ethnostate's accent on race will flag the internecine aspect of such conflicts and help to nip them in the bud.

Those who deny the existence of minority influence on the foreign policy of the United States might ask themselves this question: Would South Africa have been targeted with economic sanctions and would Israel have received massive outpourings of American financial aid, amounting in one form or another to more than $50 billion since the founding of the Zionist state in 1948, if the United States had no Negroes or Jews?

Despite the American War of Independence, the War of 1812 and a few diplomatic sore points in the 19th century, Britain and the United States maintained a relationship that often approached cousinhood. Today, British leaders, watching the changing racial makeup of America, see this traditional relationship fading. This was made plain by British Conservative Party Chairman Norman Tebbit, when he announced that this demographic shift will "inevitably" drive the two countries apart. "I'll be sorry," he said, "to see the United States becoming a less Anglo-Saxon country, a less European country."

Transforming America into a patchwork of ethnostates would probably reawaken feelings of kinship with Britain and other Northern European countries. At the same time black, Hispanic and Asian ethnostates would strengthen their own ties with Africa, Latin America and the Orient, respectively. An ethnostate or ethnostates composed of the descendants of Southern Europeans would intensify their racial and cultural links to Italy, Spain or Greece. There might even be an ethno-

state for Americans of Eastern Mediterranean and Arab origin.

Instead of an oversized, overextended, overpopulated nation seething with ethnic groups of sharply divergent backgrounds, all busy promoting their own particular foreign and domestic agendas, a string of ethnostates would permit various population groups to move in various political, economic and social directions without domestic opposition from other groups moving in opposite directions—all for purely racial reasons. Better to have separate states than separate racial groups within one state. The small monoracial state is free to follow its destiny without being hobbled by the internal racial dissension that wreaks havoc in multiracial states. Governing a melting pot whose contents have never melted and are becoming more unmeltable with each passing day is a labor that even Hercules would refuse to tackle.

Fear and distrust of foreigners and strangers is an inborn survival mechanism. It has its obvious positive points because it stimulates and strengthens group cohesion. But the same mechanism can be turned to the advantage of an aggressor who wants to stir up war fever against another state. Sad to say, one group of people can be persuaded to hate another group of people thousands of miles away even if the latter shares a lot of genes with the former. It is much easier, however, to develop an abiding hatred for strangers and aliens who move next door.

Empire-building is the opposite side of the coin of devolution. Aggressive and expansionist forces generally take over when a nation goes on the warpath. Conversely, when a nation becomes weak it poses much less of a threat to its neighbors.

Though the military aggression of one nation against another should disappear with the nation states themselves, it is inevitable that some ethnostates, egged on by overly ambitious politicians, will try to intimidate, threaten and even assault their neighbors. To avoid this situation some higher authority must make it dramatically clear that a resort to force by any state, ethno- or otherwise, would provoke swift retaliation. The use of arms or armies by any ethnostate against another would be a stern global no-no. Merchants of death caught selling arms

to anyone will meet the same fate that their wares have reserved for millions of others. Military aggression will not only go down in the law books as a high crime, but a crime against the very concept of devolution.

The Ragnarok Defense. An ethnostate relying solely on its own defense capabilities could hardly survive an assault by a well-armed, aggressive nation or group of nations. This would seem to be a reasonable statement until one asks three pertinent questions: (a) Is not a homogeneous fighting unit, all else being equal, better at combat than a heterogeneous one? (b) Do not the people of a homogeneous state display greater loyalty to the state and a greater spirit of sacrifice than a motley, disaffected, racially mixed population that has little in common but citizenship papers? (c) Is not a small monoracial state composed of a united, technologically proficient people likely to wield as much military power as a huge, sprawling, internally divided multiracial behemoth?

Though it may sound more ominous than cynical, the advent of nuclear weapons appears to have been purposely timed to usher in an era of ethnostates. Today, for perhaps the first time in history, a small state has the ability to defend itself successfully against a powerful military assailant. All that is needed to immeasurably damage the aggressor is a few thermonuclear warheads mounted on missiles that can hit and demolish the enemy's largest cities. Obviously the small state, with its meager stock of nuclear weapons, would suffer much more damage than its adversary. The odds are it would be all but obliterated. As for the aggressor state, the most it could hope for in the way of victory would be that the loss of two or three of its largest cities and millions of its population would not have a crippling and irreparable effect on its status as a great power. Faced with such a bleak prospect, no such nation is likely to start a war that would end in defeat for winner and loser alike.

Many defensive treaties would surely be enacted when ethnostates finally take shape, both in the New World and the Old. Several of the ethnostates carved out of the United States would share long stretches of frontiers. The proximity of some

of these states and their racial and cultural links would make effective defensive alliances relatively easy to organize. What is more, some of these ethnostates will either inherit a nuclear arsenal or have the technology to develop nuclear weapons in quantities and destructive power sufficient to give any potential aggressor second thoughts. Since it would be in the interest of these ethnostates to prevent any foreign power from meddling in New World affairs, there is no reason why the Monroe Doctrine could not be revived by extending a nuclear umbrella over both North and South America. Poorer and weaker ethnostates in the Western Hemisphere should welcome this protection.

In Europe any expansionist nation would be warned by a network of ethnostates that the slightest aggressive move would be met by a hail of nuclear-tipped missiles. The two atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki made it plain that any nation that still clings blindly to notions of traditional warfare would be faced with an enormous strategic disadvantage.

Every ethnostate must provide for its survival in the event of a nuclear conflict by constructing sufficient shelters and facilities, so that when the devastation is over enough citizens will have survived to rebuild the shattered infrastructure. Members of every ethnic group must have drummed into them that they and their culture must not be allowed to die. Whole cities can be buried underground or tunneled into mountains. Frozen sperm and ova will last for years, if not centuries. Only the spirit of defeat will bring about defeat. Only belief in the possibility of total destruction will make total destruction possible.

War Deterrent. Skeptics of this study have a right to ask if ethnostates, while ending many of the causes of domestic violence, might not increase the chances of war? Race has always been a prime cause of conflict. Too much stress on ethnicity might bring out more of the belligerence and aggressiveness inherent in man. Would not the benefits of the ethnostate's domestic policies be nullified by the dangers they

provoked in foreign policy?

This well-founded skepticism can be answered and perhaps allayed by asserting that the ethnostate would never fail to take into account man's aggressive nature, both as a source of his achievements and of his proneness to violence. In regard to the latter, the identification of an ailment is the first step towards its cure.

Modern warfare can all too easily be ratcheted up to genocide, which, in an ethnostate with its accent on racial preservation, is the crime of crimes. In this light, anyone who starts or leads a war of aggression automatically qualifies as a war criminal the moment his troops, his warplanes or his missiles violate another country's frontiers. He is guilty of the genocide not only of a neighboring people, but of his own people, who will suffer grievously when his victims launch a massive nuclear retaliation. Not too many politicians and generals would like to go down in history with such a blot on their reputations. In the past, historians have looked upon great conquerors with some toleration, even with an element of hero worship. Once the criminalization of war has been drilled into their minds, the citizens of ethnostates would develop a lasting suspicion of power-hungry leaders, who would probably be neutralized before they could show their hands. This suspicion, once it is widely diffused, might well provide the greatest surety against war yet devised.

There is both irony and gratification in the prospect that the ethnostate, the most anti-ecumenical of states, might prove by its enlightened, noninterventionist foreign policy to be the most effective and stalwart deterrent to the devastation of the ecumene.

Chapter 6

Unitary Politics

Statecraft. In the measurement and evaluation of political leadership, character is as important, if not more important, than intelligence. A high IQ combined with a high CQ (character quotient) provides the statesmanlike qualities needed at the helm of every society, particularly advanced societies. Unlike intelligence, character can be measured better by past performance than by tests.

A politician cannot have too much intelligence or too much character, but he can have too much ambition, which becomes a pernicious vice when it prods him to sidestep the law to win and hold office. Too much ambition, besides propelling a politician beyond the bounds of permissible conduct, often advances him to a position for which he is unqualified. Ambition, it should be added, is an extremely difficult trait to measure, though it is the factor that may weigh most heavily on a politician's performance in office.

One means of raising the quality of leadership would be to establish an academy of statecraft, with attendance restricted to mature individuals in their mid-thirties to early forties carefully selected on the basis of their résumés. After several semesters of statesmanship, the top-ranking graduates would be moved into departments of government where their work and duties corresponded to their special fields of study and competence. Once in active government, they would be graded every year, and promotions or expulsions would depend on

their performance. Such a curriculum, when combined with high intelligence and exemplary character on the part of the individuals taking it, should turn out young statesmen who would radically improve the quality of modern politics, which all too often has become the stamping ground of lowly minds.

Instead of votes, graded performance in office would become the test for high officialdom. A high grade in moral behavior would be as important as any other requirement for government posts. Moral leaders will simplify statesmanship, since their presence in high office would reduce the number of checks and balances, an often poorly functioning form of protection against political malfeasance.

The only means of doing away with government entirely would be to breed a higher type of man. But the eugenics program that would make this possible is a non-starter with timorous Western politicians. They simply will not buy the argument that *Homo sapientissimus*, a new improved human, would lead to the establishment of a new improved government that would prioritize morality over constitutions and statutory law.

Both positive and negative eugenics programs can be put in place in an ethnostate without the necessity of imposing harsh and seemingly inhuman rules and regulations, and without insulting or outraging the feelings of those who for religious or other reasons are firmly opposed to any form of biological determinism. The homogeneity of the population would do much to diminish or smooth over dysgenic attitudes and sentiments, since critics would not be able to associate eugenics with racism. Not even liberals should object too strongly to preventing the birth of defective offspring and to encouraging marriages between the more intelligent and more moral elements of the population.

Eugenics would produce a bumper crop of gifted children, whose talents could be spotted early and who could then be immersed in special education projects. Superior genes plus a superior environment designed to squeeze the best performance out of genes should prove a unique combination for producing generations of top-of-the-line statesmen.

Macfarlane Burnet in his book, *Endurance of Life*, has written that it will take at least a thousand millennia to change human nature sufficiently to accept a sensible eugenics program. Let us hope his timetable is off by 999,990 years.

Ethnostates would create small, strong unities out of large, weak unities and transform the world into a brilliant and colorful patchwork of sovereignties. Ethnostates would unite once-divided communities by distilling out the incompatible racial and cultural groups and, where feasible, combining like with like. New political entities would be formed, largely by rearranging and modifying old ones.

Race, by providing a population group with a set of physical and mental traits that distinguish it from other groups, is a strong force for unity. Since every political and social entity must have some binding force, nothing would serve this purpose better than ethnicity. The grand purpose of ethnostates is to make the most of human differences by letting them develop and flourish in their own unique settings uninfluenced by alien cultures and races. Using atomic fission as a metaphor, the splitting of nations and empires can be looked upon as the creation of a huge psychological force field, which keeps the human mind radiating. The proper management and control of these bursts of imagination and inventiveness should be a prime goal of political, economic and social leadership.

Some Words on Citizenship. There is no such animal as a pure citizen, a so-called citizen of the universe, except in the minds of globalists and wishful thinkers. Every person, even the protagonist in Edward Everett Hale's *Man Without a Country*, started out as a citizen or at least a native of some state. Today, most Westerners are citizens in name only. The various political and social obligations that an authentic citizen owes his country have mostly gone by the boards, along with such intangibles of citizenship as a sense of belonging and various sentimental attachments. In the West, many of these modern, faint-hearted, half-baked citizens have been psychologically quarantined inside their own countries, while more

dynamic population groups take over. They still retain some pride in what their ancestors accomplished in the art of nation-building, but are largely unashamed that they have let their inheritance fall into other hands.

People have difficulty believing they are more than nominal citizens of a state in which they have lost faith. Without an *esprit d'état,* all that holds a state together is a few shreds of tradition, a common economic system and the force of law. This is woefully insufficient cement. In the great moments of Western civilization persons were proud to boast: "I am an Athenian...I am a Florentine...I am a Frenchman...I am an Englishman...I am an American." Today, many people actually apologize for being citizens of country A, B or C. In this decadent age it is often considered chauvinistic or even jingoistic to claim allegiance to one's own nation.

States, particularly large and overpopulated nation states, should not become holding pens for drifting waves of humanity. They should remain living expressions of the artistic, scientific and productive acumen of their citizens. The people who have been making Western cities unlivable should have stayed at home and made their own cities livable. Ethnostates would encourage their citizens to make their own cities more attractive and comfortable for themselves, not for aliens, legal or illegal, who bring with them the behavior patterns and attitudes that created the slums they left behind. Inevitably, the cities they move to begin to resemble the ones they fled.

The Altruist/Egotist Balance. Altruism might be defined as both a curse and a blessing. Without this instinct, we would be living in a Hobbesian world of incessant warfare, which is to say, we would hardly be living at all. On the other hand, if we were endowed with too much altruism, we would have an equally poor chance of surviving, since we would put our own lives second and everyone else's first. In certain circumstances, self-sacrifice is beneficial, even crucial, to survival. But when altruism asks us to put higher values on the lives of others than we put on our own, our very existence is at risk.

The ethnostate is made to order for the maintenance of the proper (and often delicate) balance of a successful society. It is small and united enough for its authorities to douse the flare-ups of altruism that can lead to dangerous meddling in the affairs of foreign states. At home too much egotism can end in unrestrained anarchy.

Though it promotes the cooperation and mutual aid without which civilization is impossible, altruism must be reined in when it reaches a state's frontiers. It should not be extended to fishing in the muddy waters of other people's problems. There is always plenty of work cut out for altruism at home. People on the other side of town are often in greater need than someone halfway around the globe. We should be very leery of those who keep urging us to work for "the greater good" of those who care nothing for *our* good.

Expansive or exaggerated altruism is a symptom of high civilization on the way down. It is noticeably absent in the birth throes of a state. "Other caring," in the sense of caring for outsiders, can only be afforded when the survival of one's own population group is assured. Only when individuals no longer have to worry about tomorrow, or about acquiring the bare necessities of life, can they afford, if they are so minded, to let their attention roam to foreign shores.

On the domestic front, as a state ages, minorities depend on the altruism of the majority to obtain the privileges they strive for, but may not always deserve. To paraphrase Shakespeare, some minorities are born equal, some achieve equality and some have equality thrust upon them.

Affirmative action, operative in varying degrees in practically all Western countries, is altruism pushed to the extreme and enacted into law. Once this happens and reverse discrimination becomes the order of the day, the level of altruism in the general populace will slowly drop off.

Traces of egotism can almost always be found in altruistic acts. The donor of a large sum of money to a charity takes great pleasure and pride in giving, even when he does so anonymously. Western governments have been so successful in showering their own citizens and foreigners with material com-

forts that they have fallen into what might be called an "altruistic frenzy." Western foundations and private donors vie with each other in giving the so-called disadvantaged nations whatever they ask for. Meanwhile, domestic altruism is enshrined in vast, budget-busting welfare programs.

Too much altruism dulls the work incentive that must be instilled in all able recipients of aid if they are ever to climb above the poverty line. To stop the vicious cycle in which welfare creates demands for more welfare, we have to become more egotistic without becoming egomaniacal. Altruism is "affordable" when the political, social and particularly the economic conditions are ripe. When they are not, altruism is or at least should be put on hold.

Among its many negatives, altruism has a tendency to make us "soft" and excessively kind to others. Not so long ago our ancestors looked upon bloody hand-to-hand warfare with equanimity. Today, we are squeamish at bullfights and swallow handfuls of pills at the slightest twinge of discomfort. Altruism, which flourishes in eras of "the easy life," puts us in the wrong psychological mood to accept physical suffering and abuse, which in turn prevents the adoption of the stern measures needed to maintain order and discipline. Altruism, in short, helps to immobilize us in times of crisis.

Character. Controversy swirls around IQ scores, which are valid for measuring, if not intelligence, at least verbal agility and mathematical skills. Whatever else can be said about them, IQ scores are fairly good predictors of how well or how poorly a student will do in school and college.

But how to measure character? Some preeminent psychologists (Raymond Cattell comes to mind) have developed a battery of comprehensive tests to achieve this objective, though some psychologists dispute the results. It turns out that minority groups with low average IQs also have character problems. This may explain why certain blacks, even those with above-average intelligence, often get into trouble the moment they are made cabinet officers, congressmen, judges, mayors, police chiefs and sheriffs. There have been, of course,

many whites in similar positions who have committed similar irregularities. But is it not reasonable to suppose that those who have finally broken the old occupational taboos would go out of their way to keep their hands clean?

Character is an amalgam of honesty, prudence, industriousness and dedication. All the brains in the world are useless, in fact they could be dangerous, unless they are modulated by character.

Different population groups differ in their collective character. What is considered a virtue by one group may be a vice to another. This is why it is so important that the leaders of a group be members of that group. Grave misunderstandings arise in politics because of innate differences in character between the rulers and the ruled.

It hardly needs to be added that there is a definite biological element to character. The greater the biological differences in the population of a country, the greater the difficulty of keeping that population in line. Character can be taught (instilled) and character can be altered, but always with great difficulty. Why not avoid this difficulty by letting like live with like—the fundamental principle of the ethnostate?

Sore Points of Democracy. A blunt definition of democracy is that it is only possible and practical among peoples with a high ability to smoke out demagogues. When the system of choosing leaders excludes the wise and favors the windbag, the fragile political plant known as democracy begins to wilt. Here we are not trying to give credence to the old but impractical saw that political power should be given to those who least desire it. This is too neat a paradox. Any man with a gift for politics understands quite well that without political support he will have difficulty getting his ideas over the high barrier that separates thinking from doing. Since those who believe they have a good idea generally want to make it known, they are drawn willy-nilly into a quest for power, which in the contemporary West leads directly into the political thicket of democracy. However, when the game of politics is found to be too rough and too distasteful for the power seeker's con-

science, when the effort required is no longer commensurate with the objective, the political aspirant, if he has anything to him at all, is likely to quit and return to the familiar and comfortable, if much more limiting and prosaic, hearth of private life.

There are certain demands of politics that are likely to bring the office seeker's career to a quick and decisive halt—demands that grate against his principles and require behavior totally alien to his nature. The mere act of grabbing a microphone at a public meeting and shouting a rebuttal to some slanderous remarks mouthed by an opponent is to many sensitive souls a boorish and repulsive piece of demeaning buffoonery. This inborn revulsion against displays of temperament is found in higher frequencies in some races than in others, which helps explain why democracies, the efficacy and viability of which depend in large measure on the self-control of both leaders and followers, function best in lands populated by less mercurial and more inhibited races.

The historical record shows very few entries for Negroid and Mongoloid democracies. Democratic and republican forms of government appear to be a unique feature of Europeans, particularly North and Northwest Europeans, and their overseas descendants. It is too early to assess the staying power of Japanese democracy.

The erosion of form and style in government inevitably leads to the destruction of content. Differences in temperament and character put a large strain on the democratic process when it tries to encompass more than one population group, particularly since only whites have demonstrated an enduring affinity for self-government. In this context an authoritarian state is not just the cyclic repair of a disintegrating popular government, but a last opportunity for power by those who have lost it.

When referring to democracy in the United States, it is worthwhile to recall that (as of 1991) by far the largest number of congressmen are incumbents and that much of their legislative work has been fobbed off on their staff and on commissions whose members are not elected. These commiss-

ions, though theoretically beholden to Congress, administer welfare, enforce or fail to enforce immigration laws, fine-tune the budget and, in the case of the Federal Reserve Bank, which is not beholden to Congress, even determine interest rates and the money supply. The increasing trend towards government by commissions and independent agencies is a trend towards less, not more, democracy.

The radical shift in political definitions in the last six or seven decades is dramatically demonstrated in the 1928 *War Department Training Manual* (2000-25, Section 118-120), which defined democracy as follows:

> A government of the masses. Authority derived through mass meeting or any other form of "direct" expression. Results in mobocracy. Attitude towards property is communistic—negating property rights. Attitude towards law is that the will of the majority shall regulate, whether it be based upon deliberation or governed by passion, prejudice, and impulse, without restraint or regard to consequences. Results in demagogism, license, agitation, discontent, anarchy.

Nowadays, democracy receives a much friendlier press. "Democratic" used as an adjective has become a synonym for "good." Though the Constitution spoke only of a republican form of government, democracy draws considerably more attention in current high-school political science courses and textbooks.

To function properly, democracy demands an intelligent, restrained electorate, not an emotional mob. If any government described as democratic remains democratic for a reasonable length of time, the chances are it is a government of the descendants of the people who invented democracy and the only people who ever came close to making it work. (Both the ancient Greeks, who invented it, and the English, who improved on it, had considerable infusions of Nordic genes.)

Democracy in much of the West has for all intents and purposes supplanted Christianity as the state religion. In some areas of academia and politics, it has reached a manic stage, resembling in intensity and obsessiveness the dancing craze of the Middle Ages. Like an older and abdicating divinity, the god of democracy is a jealous god, who allows no other form of politics to come before him. Even Communists felt com-

pelled to promise democracy to their minions after the workers' paradise had passed through (which it never did) the stage known as "the dictatorship of the proletariat."

This said, it should be added that democracy, especially in large nations, has become somewhat of a sham. Many elected representatives "of the people" hardly pretend to represent anyone but special interests and lobbies, and have little time to attend to the needs of their own constituencies. While in office, most of their time and energy is expended on avoiding hard political decisions, raising money for their next stint of electioneering and doing favors for the individuals and political action committees (PACs) that contribute the money that will get them reelected.

In multiracial democracies government has largely been reduced to buying off the demands of minorities with increasing amounts of welfare and race-based job quotas. This favoritism extends to foreign aid, most of which goes to the overseas cousins of the minorities that make the biggest noise and provide most of the campaign money.

In an ethnostate no such racial infighting would or could take place. The business of government would be conducted for the benefit of the people at large, not for the benefit of a few. But even in an ethnostate, where conditions would optimize its effectiveness, democracy would hardly deserve the high theological status it has attained in the West. Most great thinkers and political philosophers from the Greeks on have assigned democracy a low place on their scale of statecraft. From the pre-Socratics to Hobbes few philosophers worth their salt had a good word to say for it, most of the criticism resting on the argument that sooner or later democracy descends into mindlessness, brutality and corruption. Despite these repeated warnings, something similar to modern democracy began to take shape in Britain in the 17th century, although slavery, hardly a democratic institution, was not outlawed by the British till 1828 and survived in the U.S. several decades longer. The universal franchise, the linchpin of democracy, was not fully instituted in the West until this century.

Although lovers of democracy might characterize the fol-

lowing questions as blasphemy, they will nevertheless be asked:

Would a wise autocrat have permitted the United States to enter World War I, the outcome of which almost mandated World War II?. . .Would wise autocrats have drawn up and signed the Versailles Treaty, an open invitation to a future war?. . .Would a wise autocrat have permitted the wild and counterproductive stabs at unbridled democracy that all but destroyed the Weimar Republic in Germany?. . .Above all, would an intelligent American autocrat, his own country the first to have fission and fusion bombs, have allowed other countries to steal American secrets and build their own weapons of mass destruction?. . .Would not a smart autocrat have realized that this was a crucial moment in history, a never-to-be-repeated moment, when one country, by maintaining a monopoly of nuclear bombs, could have prevented the proliferation of such weapons, which once in the possession of a dozen or so nations would be almost certain to be unleashed on many parts of the world?. . .Would a wise autocrat have allowed his country to become entangled in Middle Eastern wars and politics at an incredible cost in money and some cost in lives to placate the minority that pours more dollars than any other population group into the election campaigns of key congressmen, who later return the favor by tossing more than $3 billion a year into the bottomless pit of Israel's economy?

History reminds us that democracies start just as many wars as "evil" dictatorships; that democracies destroy the environment almost as fast and as thoroughly as tyrannies; that it is much safer to walk the city streets in authoritarian states than in most democracies.

Though it can hardly be counted as a plus, dictatorships distribute poverty more evenly than affluent democracies parcel out affluence. Both forms of government, gathering their strength, not from the intelligence but from the stupidity and inertia of their populations, produce hopelessly inadequate leaders. Some occupants of the White House and the Kremlin would make better cab drivers than chief executives of coun-

tries bristling with nuclear bombs and warheads.

Though it may sound sacrilegious to say so in this age of equalitarian chic, democracy is not the *sine qua non* of politics. Assuredly the "people," who have little idea of what is going on beyond what they are permitted to see on the nightly TV news, cannot be expected to vote intelligently on important issues. Nor will they be able to cast their ballots for worthy candidates, since few such are willing to participate in the electoral rat race. Sadly, the average voter has practically no input in the choice of candidates selected by party leaders. Primaries were invented to overcome this handicap, but to little avail. With rare exceptions the electorate's choice is still limited to candidates selected by the professionals. Since money is the root of all politics in Western democracies, the politician with the fattest wallets at his beck and call has a considerable head start. Short of money and shorn of media support, third-party or write-in candidates nearly always go down in defeat.

The fleshless and bloodless monster known as "public opinion" never ceases to drum into the heads of voters that there are only two forms of governments: democracy, which is good, and anything else, which is evil. This simplistic dichotomy has become an article of Western faith. Plato's proposal for rule by philosopher kings is never mentioned, unless accompanied by a shrug or a sneer. Yet even the most religiose small or big D democrat, if he stops to think, would be hard put to deny that a government which places highly qualified individuals, the *crème de la crème* of the citizenry, into positions of power and leadership, would be a good government, whether or not it was democratic.

Democracy eventually becomes, in the words of Thomas Jefferson, an "elected despotism," as the political and economic distance between rulers and ruled lengthens. A direct democracy in the style of ancient Athens, where every citizen was a member of the assembly, could not exist in a nation like the United States, where a president and vice-president and 535 members of the House and Senate are chosen to represent the will of 240 million Americans. Time after time, polls have

shown that the governments of large democracies, rather than representing a majority of the citizenry, promote the agenda of one or two minorities. In the United States, most citizens want a sharp reduction in immigration and an end to reverse discrimination—front-burner issues that the leading politicians, fearful of a liberal and media backlash, will not touch.

It is not blasphemous to suggest that a few unelected wise men at the helm of state could do a better job than hundreds of elected fools. The standard objection to such a suggestion is that the wise men would soon turn into tyrants, a danger that democracies avoid by constitutional checks and balances. The objection to this objection, which is not often heard, is that wise men are not compelled by some insidious gene or interior demon to turn into tyrants. If they are truly wise, they would be very careful not to indulge in any provocative absolutism that might bring back democracy.

The querulous devotees of the "rule of the people" will want to know how these wise leaders will be chosen. For one thing, they would not be chosen as present-day politicians are—by huge outpourings of cash into party coffers, by furtive under-the-table political deals and by inane television commercials. It would seem only reasonable that a higher type of candidate for office would emerge if he were not selected by party hacks and a plurality of voters who know next to nothing about him. The fate of a state often depends on the head of state. Would it not be wiser after a careful review of his achievements to date, plus a thorough assessment of his intelligence and character, to have him chosen by a board of outstanding citizens rather than by an uninformed collection of citizens who are all too easily mesmerized by the slickest demagogue?

Be that as it may, the most suitable form of government for an ethnostate would be the one that best fits the traditions and customs of its population. Most of the world's peoples have had no experience with democracy, having lived forever under "strongmen" and monarchs. Although it would never be intimated on high-rated TV news programs, more important than getting out the vote is getting top-quality leaders. To

attain this all-important goal, no type of government should be impervious to change and modification.

The best political advice to the citizens of an ethnostate would be: Do what is necessary to put the power of the state in the hands of the most capable among you, not the least capable. Admit it or not, there is an aspect of politics, aside from the desire for power and fame, that attracts scoundrels—money. To remove the financial lure in politics should be a principal task of all statesmen, democratic or autocratic.

If democratic pundits can answer the following question convincingly, an overall argument can be made for democracy. If they cannot, then this hallowed form of government should be desacralized. The question: Is it sensible or even moral for every citizen to have an equal vote, which at least in theory translates into an equal voice in deciding important domestic and foreign issues? Consider two citizens: Citizen A with an 82 IQ has never held a job for more than three months, has been on welfare almost continuously since his birth and has five children, whom he has abandoned, along with the five unmarried women who were their mothers. Compare Citizen A with Citizen B, an award-winning scientist with several inventions to his credit, an IQ of 145 and a stable family consisting of a wife and two well-brought-up children. No hint of divorce, philandering, drugs or crime appears in his personal history.

Despite the sharp contrast in these two résumés, the votes of Citizen A and Citizen B weigh equally in any election. Citizen A votes as he is told by the head of a powerful minority voting bloc. Citizen B, on the other hand, is an independent voter who belongs to no party. After some scrutiny of opposing candidates and a little soul-searching, he casts his ballot for the candidate who seems to be more knowledgeable about the issues. Despite their vast differences in character, knowledge and general all-around capability, we are told again and again by politicians, educators and mediacrats that Citizens A and B should have an equal say in choosing the people who govern them. Instead of this most serious of all democratic defects correcting itself, it grows worse as Citizen A types become

more numerous, owing to disparate birthrates.

It is possible to make a case for democracy in a small country with a highly educated, highly responsible population group. But what can be said for a democracy that provides a stage for an irresponsible demagogue urging an ever larger bloc of indolent and ignorant voters to vote for him or for candidates he already has in his pocket?

Politics must advance beyond democracy, whose intolerant priests seek to quash any attempts to develop more advanced systems. To the ruling establishment any speculation that goes beyond democracy is considered impermissible as well as disrespectable.

Even where democracies are overthrown, the leader, dictator, general or commissar who assumes power will often bow lower to "public opinion" than did his democratic predecessors. Since the ruler thrown up in the anti-democratic upheaval will most likely be a "man of the people" or a "man on horseback," he may be no better qualified to govern than the blowhards he has ousted. The wise man who has to be drafted to lead is a far safer choice than the politico elected to lead, than the rightist or leftist revolutionary who claws his way to power, than the general who takes over by a *coup d'état.*

Tolerating Tolerance. Too much democracy produces anarchy, which leads to autocracy, which leads back again to democracy. Too much tolerance produces intolerance, which eventually cycles to a new birth of tolerance. Tolerance, as it is understood and practiced in modern times, stands for tolerance of both the good and the bad. Tolerance of the good generates more tolerance, which inevitably leads to increasing tolerance for evil. The fact is, the evil consequences of tolerance often have more popular appeal than the good consequences. A wave of pornography is the immediate and automatic response to sexual tolerance.

Tolerance can be prevented from provoking intolerance by choking off its negative side and encouraging it not to attack tolerance per se, but the "everything goes" tolerance that leads to social decay and moral degradation. If overindulgence

in premarital and extramarital sex is a contributing cause of the decline of civilization, then tolerance of sexual permissiveness should be reconsidered. If Marxists, Harvard professors and various other "nurturists" try to outlaw genetic research on the tenuous ground that it leads to biological determinism, then this particularly nauseous exhibit of intolerance must not be tolerated. Tolerance of censors, of those who shut off debates on issues to which they are opposed, needs to be exercised with a certain amount of caution.

In crucial areas of human behavior, tolerance is largely judgmental. Historically, the only people who have practiced tolerance on the grand scale have been Westerners and then only for limited periods of time. But even this relatively short-lived and sporadic tolerance must be more than an environmental coincidence.

People who have a predisposition for tolerance and who live in their own state among their own kind will have less reason or occasion to be intolerant. They will not be bothered or irritated by the different behavior and attitudes of alien population groups. In consequence, they will be better able to restrict their disputes to the realm of ideas and avoid racial and religious digressions.

Doctrinal Updating. It is no surprise that the argument for ethnostates clashes head-on with the doctrine of nationhood. The British constitution is unwritten, but it contains a body of law, some elements of which accelerated the breakup of the empire, but which would directly oppose devolution in the United Kingdom. To establish ethnostates in America the written constitution would have to be amended in such a manner as to make it almost unrecognizable. Among much else, the Declaration of Independence's appeal for "a more perfect union" would have to be discarded in the wastebasket of ideas that have outlived their usefulness and been outmoded by time.

Traditions established by enduring forms of statehood exert a powerful force for conserving the state and for clinging to the status quo, which is why the breakup of larger into smaller

political entities will be as fiercely resisted by conservatives as by liberals and leftists. For this reason, ethnostate advocates would do well to emphasize and highlight the impermanence of doctrine. Doctrine emerges from the collective will, if not of the people, at least of an elite. It addresses both the historical experience and the problems at hand. It steadies the ship of state and makes a great deal of sense as long as the seas do not get too stormy and the keel holds fast.

The American Founding Fathers composed the Bill of Rights, which provided strong legal protection to trespassers of the law by guaranteeing them due process. If James Madison and George Mason, the two gentlemen most responsible for Amendments I through X of the Constitution, had lived in New York City two centuries later and faced the same task, would they have produced the same document? The Bill of Rights was devised for a small, pioneering nation, whose citizenry derived almost entirely from the British Isles. These Britons had developed a certain respect for individual rights and had already succeeded in abolishing some of the more tyrannical aspects of absolutism.

Two centuries later in New York City, where crime is almost out of control, where the British element of the population has all but vanished, where the population is largely composed of inimical and feuding racial groups, many of whose members had migrated from countries with no experience whatsoever with democracy, the conditions confronting the authors working on a new Bill of Rights would be radically different from the conditions that existed in the late 18th century.

At work on a new or revised Bill of Rights, Madison and Mason would certainly have extended much more legal protection to the victims of crime than to criminals. Nevertheless, leaders of almost all political persuasions, as well as the minority members who directly benefit from the liberties provided by the first Ten Amendments, keep appealing to the Constitution and due process when they try, in most cases in vain, to cope with the surge of criminality. Unheedful of the sound proverbial advice, *autres temps, autres moeurs*, the same constitutional protections are still in place. What was appropriate

two centuries ago for one population group is by no means appropriate for a totally different mix of people in a vast, unwieldy, crime-ridden heterogeneous nation.

Doctrine depends on time and place. When time and place change, doctrine, if it is to continue to have any relevancy, must change. As history painfully demonstrates, however, it is one of the last things to change. More often than not, political doctrines have to be dragged up to the present and revised and remodeled by force. The more doctrine lags behind the times, the more abrupt will be the way it is changed, when it can no longer avoid change. The breathless modernization of Japan in the latter half of the 19th century, the transformation of the British Empire into the British Commonwealth, the convulsions of the Soviet Union in the 20th century, the establishment of the European Community—all these radical changes, sometimes violent, sometimes peaceful, were preceded or accompanied by radical changes of doctrine.

Almost anyone can piece together a doctrine. The trick is to formulate one that is realistic, that applies to the conditions at hand and has a better than even chance of being implemented. In an age when much of the world is graying with pollution, uniformity and lawlessness, when nations are losing what little character they have left, growing numbers of Westerners are ready to shed anachronistic doctrines for ones better suited to the times. Hanging on to dead ideas that should have been buried long since, is, besides being an invitation to disaster, a perversion that comes close to ideological necrophilia.

Equalitarian Mania. Equality, reduced to its bare essentials, is simply a "spur word" that prods one population group to believe its lack of achievement and second-rate status are not its fault, but the fault of "others."

Equality, fired by the altruistic instinct active or latent in man, is an issue made-to-order for emotional politics. Envy, ambition, hypocrisy and mendacity are traits that are easily, all too easily, linked to leveling and egalitarian movements. Knowing full well that the equality they preach can never be achieved, irresponsible politicians promote it all the more

feverishly, well aware that their grandstanding promises can rouse people, especially minorities, to flock to the voting booth. In all their flights of inflammatory oratory these class warriors never actually tell their followers to go out and rob those who are conceived to be better off. They phrase their words more carefully, but that is the message they are really conveying. Instead of outright confiscation of property and a straightforward, all-around redistribution of wealth, the political levelers restrict their talk to "progressive" income taxes, minority set-asides and quotas, and sundry other financial machinations to redistribute wealth into the open palms of the "disadvantaged." Deny it as the class warriors will, their stump speeches add up to plain and simple electoral bribery.

There would be less of this leveling demagoguery in an ethnostate, if only because there would be more equality to start with. By definition multiracial and multicultural states tend to have an excess of the social and economic inequalities that bedevil any society, including the incendiary and abrasive feelings of inequality provoked by the presence of several races.

The physical traits separating and identifying people are more difficult to hide or camouflage than differences in character and intelligence. Those who because of their inherited differences often get the short end of the stick in racially mixed societies are not always willing to accept their lowly status supinely. On occasion they are driven to obtain by mass violence what they believe they cannot acquire by individual effort. It is unnecessary to point out that a revolution incited by racial as well as economic differences is easier to instigate than one based simply on unequal divisions of wealth.

Since an ethnostate will not be handicapped by racial divisiveness, it will have one less endemic source of popular discontent with which to contend. Fewer evidences of inequality will make the state more stable and revolution-proof. By allowing its leaders to concentrate on the problems of one people, their own people, rather than on a welter of peoples, the ethnostate would be able to create and implement more equitable economic policies and programs without the terrible

waste of time and manpower multiracial states are forced to devote to racial issues.

Even in the relatively rare case when an oppressed population group obtains equal rights with the dominant group, racial agitation seldom ends. It is not too long a leap from the demands for equal opportunity to laws mandating equal results, from outlawing discrimination against an oppressed group to legalizing discrimination by this same group against its former oppressors. Affirmative action, no matter how you slice it, is nothing but reverse racism.

The campaign for equality is such a popular political ploy that politicians are reluctant to give it up even when equality has become the law of the land. Minority spokesmen find it politically inexpedient to acknowledge that the fight has been won, but go on as before—until they reach the point where they have "out-equaled" majority members. Sooner or later the "outs" turn the tables on the "ins" and rely on their own brand of racism to guard and expand their new ascendancy.

Readers of pre-Enlightenment political philosophers and writers on the human condition sense a certain hardness that has all but disappeared from the work of their modern counterparts. Perhaps hardness is too harsh a term. A more circumspect way of putting it might be that Western thinkers several centuries ago were less burdened by sentiment.

Sentiment entered Western political philosophy by way of humanitarianism, the path for which was prepared by Christianity. Humanitarians do not necessarily believe all men are equal, but they do believe that all men should be treated equally. Thomas Jefferson could write that "all men are created equal," while lording it over an army of slaves at Monticello. He may have treated his slaves kindly, but certainly not as equals. Today, humanitarianism demands that people not only be treated equally, but be viewed as equals. Religionists subscribe to this theory by preaching more about mankind than man. Ironically, in all organized religions hierarchy soon replaces equality in the upper reaches of the clergy.

The concept of the ethnostate places less emphasis on

humanity in the abstract and more emphasis on real human differences. The mere acknowledgment of such differences calls for a comprehensive and more developed human taxonomy. All the new anthropological and biological data piling up in research laboratories these days may lead to a significant redefinition of man. For thousands of years one seldom thought of men without thinking of their breed. Race or stock was seldom separated from the individual, who was looked upon so unsentimentally that for much of human history slavery was accepted and even advocated by many of the foremost philosophers and statesmen.

This is not to recommend that the American South should rise again. Had it not been for the "peculiar institution," there might be less egalitarianism in contemporary political discourse. Slavery, the worst example of inequality, permitted abolitionists to make their case more effectively and dramatically, and in the process give a huge boost to false notions about the unimportance of human differences.

What is being recommended here is not a return to human bondage, but a modified reworking of the old practice of viewing men and women as members of breeds, stocks and races, of viewing them as biological as well as political and economic beings. This is not to put some races above others, but simply to admit their differences and to endow the social sciences with a larger fund of anthropological know-how.

People have no trouble associating dogs, horses or many other animals, wild and domestic, with particular breeds. Only in regard to man and only in relatively recent times has it become an act of bigotry to speak too loudly or write too energetically about human breeds.

The Question of Freedom. No one is free or even half-free. We have no say over our birth and, do what we will, we cannot escape death, though we can hasten or delay it. Chief among man-made restrictions on freedom are laws. We rationalize these legal curbs by saying freedom can only be obtained by limiting freedom. We enact laws to regulate manners, behavior, dress codes, even speech. Too many of these regulations in-

fringe on the freedom to be oneself, perhaps the greatest freedom of all.

Free nations are best, we are taught from the first grade on, although free nations have their unfree periods and in time of war are often as tyrannical as so-called authoritarian states. We are not taught, indeed we have never been taught, that the crime rate is often highest in those countries where the most popular of present-day freedoms—human rights—is the greatest of all rights, a sort of latter-day Ten Commandments all rolled up into one.

Perhaps it is time to take another look at freedom, a topic that has been so drowned in rhetoric that it has lost whatever real meaning it may once have had. Today, the word freedom has degenerated into little more than a one-word religious chant, something similar to the Hare Krishna "om." When it appears in writing or speech, it hardly registers on the mind. A word that contains a lot of punch when used sparingly becomes meaningless when used indiscriminately.

The only freedom that really counts is the ability to make sensible choices and decisions that are beyond the reach of Mother Nature and Father Nurture. The man who is most free is the inventor or artist. It is impossible for anyone to be genuinely creative unless he has separated and freed himself, at least partially, from the existential norms of the human condition.

Those interested in freedom should remember that the freest person is the least involved, the least entangled person. Similarly, the freest people are those least involved and least entangled with other countries and population groups. The freest form of foreign policy is isolationism, which obviates entanglements that mandate involvement in the affairs of others.

Different races and cultures have different attitudes towards free expression. What is culture shock to one population group may be perfectly acceptable to another group. Free speech encourages the free and open exchange of ideas, but all too often it decays into a rancorous tool for slander. As individuals "freely" outshout each other, the insults erupt into a volcanic flow of calumny.

Leadership. Who would knowingly vote for a candidate for political office who has no principles? Who would cast his ballot for a moral skeleton who rattles and shifts with the political breezes, who in the course of "service to his people" goes through one political reincarnation after another, whose set of beliefs one day is dumped for an opposite set the next day, whose voting record is as transient as alternating current? Democracies, it must be confessed, have often elected such scoundrels to high office.

Anyone who studies the performance of prominent 20th-century Western politicians has to come to the conclusion that the method of electing leaders worthy of their salt has broken down. Democracy often seems to be in the business of selecting *against* leadership qualities. Election campaigns have become traveling circuses, in which the candidates are the chief clowns. Those most qualified for leadership would be the last to take part in such distasteful rigmaroles.

Among the many defects of present-day democratic elections, one of the most salient is the triumph of decibels and physical energy over reason and intelligence. Although the wise speak more intelligently than the unwise, the very foundation of their wisdom is a gestalt of temperament and introversion that prevents them from proclaiming their wisdom at every street corner; that keeps them from promoting their political programs strenuously enough to overcome the noisy but empty bleating of their fast-talking rivals.

Because they must appeal to a multitude of different constituencies, politicians in a multiracial and multicultural state try to be "all things to all men." It being impossible under such circumstances for any politician to make everyone happy, only an actor, a demagogue or an inveterate prevaricator can pretend to pull off such a feat. In contrast, the ethnostate legislator is one with his constituents. He knows with whom he is dealing and whom he represents. He has to make fewer compromises and promises. He can afford to be less of a political chameleon. By furnishing a better launching pad and a better environment for leadership, all else being equal, ethnostates should be overflowing, not with politicians but with statesmen.

A multiplicity of favorable events and circumstances have to jell at one particular point in time to produce a great leader or statesman. In climactic epochs, the present era in the West being one of them, it is open season on politicians who put principles above popularity. The result is "leaderless resistance," a situation in which inexperienced but dedicated men spring up to take the place of the officials who are killed, hounded out of office or prevented from campaigning for office the moment they talk forthrightly about issues.

Reconsiderations. As there are economies of scale, so there is the politics of scale, both of which, while they ease some of the problems of managing large societies, multiply others. Economies of scale make it profitable to manufacture some products more efficiently and cheaply, but they sharply reduce choice, if not quality, and they have a tendency to turn production-line workers into robots. The politics of scale eventuates in mountains of laws, rules and regulations devised to allow bureaucrats to control the behavior of disparate population groups which, if given free rein, might explode in civil and racial strife. As we have all learned to our sorrow, bureaucracies not only tend towards self-perpetuation, but towards self-aggrandizement—the more government agencies, the greater the pressure to increase the number of agencies, the greater the cultural and racial mix, the greater the need to force a heterogeneous populace to do what a homogeneous people would often do instinctively and voluntarily.

Ethnostates would be made to order for small and streamlined governments, since there would be no need for reams of legislation to protect and compensate the less capable and less successful ethnic groups that proliferate in pluralistic societies. The race-based judicial decisions and rulings that pour out of court hoppers in a large multiracial state would overload the data bank of a mainframe computer.

Though the politics of scale and the economy of scale are always attempting to make government and business more workable and efficient, they are also busy engendering monsters of centralization. The best proving ground for 21st-cen-

tury politics is definitely not a huge nation state, which makes truly innovative approaches to government almost impossible. With a large number of small states available for political and economic experimentation, progress towards new political solutions could be greatly advanced. Tests conducted under many different conditions and circumstances are likely to be more productive than those made in one concretized environment.

Political inventiveness will never amount to much unless the creativity of the citizenry is unleashed. The legal and psychological barriers in multiracial states, where almost every move, private and public, must bow to racial considerations, has the effect of crippling ingenuity. Even science has had to bend to the equalitarian mystique now rampant in the First World. With tough government restrictions placed on genetic research and with the study of racial differences dangerous to an anthropologist's or geneticist's career, it should be obvious that many of the most important problems facing modern man will not be fully addressed as long as multiracial and multicultural politics remains the only permissible politics in Western countries.

Paradoxically, the honest anti-racist will have a much better chance of seeing his dreams of racial harmony come true in a world of ethnostates than in a gigantic, unwieldy, multinational state of clashing ethnic groups.

An ethnostate, because of its relatively small size and because of the communal attitudes which it infuses in its citizenry, could afford to be loosely run, meaning that it could get by with minimal laws, while offering everyone maximum opportunities for involvement in government.

Minutiae. Aside from working to reduce the size of his political realm, the successful politician of the future should be a good prophet. He should have a program already worked out to cope with his predictions when they materialize. Contrary to Jesus' expert opinion, prophets even in their own country are not without honor when their forecasts, dire or roseate, come to pass. Despite his doomsaying and his neces-

sarily unpopular views, the politician with his finger on the pulse of his people—and on history—will put his Pollyanna-sounding rivals in the shade in times of crisis.

Successful politics is based on an intelligent mix of short-term and long-term thinking. In the past, political considerations often yielded to individual worries about salvation. Now that so many of us disbelieve in an afterlife, the politician's wish to leave behind a good name and a respectable posthumous reputation is likely to exert more influence on his actions and behavior than religion. Promises of eternal bliss in heaven or eternal damnation below once helped sustain a measure of honesty and decency in office. Now that most Western politicians have lost their fear of divine retribution, we must forget the old adage that gods have often been better able than mortals to get man to behave. With divine intervention removed from human affairs, people must now depend on reason, common sense, intelligence and peer pressure for good government.

Although liberals of both the honest and dishonest variety seem to be the last to know it, the age of liberalism is over. Every age has its enshrined credos which often start out as impregnable truths. Liberalism in one form or another helped disperse the obscurantist fog of feudalism and absolute monarchy. Having served its purpose, it has no more relevance than that equally moribund political philosophy known as conservatism. What on earth is conservative about worshipping free-market economics and giving hardly a thought to the racial and cultural havoc wreaked by the huge influx into the white world of nonwhite immigrants? If conservatism means anything, it should be concerned first and foremost with conserving the race.

The threat of physical violence and mass disturbances is sometimes the accelerator, sometimes the squelcher, of political activity, particularly in regard to legislation. Politicians have learned to expect violent reactions to their votes on important bills. Having grown up in a world of terrorist attacks and assassinated government officials, the congressman, M.P. or deputy knows his own life is less protected than that of presi-

dents and prime ministers. If Theodore Roosevelt, Huey Long, the two Kennedys, George Wallace and Ronald Reagan can be killed or wounded by assassins or would-be assassins, lowlier, less guarded public officials make easier targets.

To vote for unrestricted immigration, racial quotas or other special rights and privileges for minorities carries with it, at this point in time, few possibilities of retaliation. Such legislation only angers, but does not activate, majority whites. Congressmen or parliamentarians who want to reduce immigration and vote against racial quotas, however, invite, if not physical retaliation, the day-to-day pummeling of a rabid media. To avoid the heat, many politicians, regardless of their own beliefs and feelings, vote on the most controversial legislation as their country's liberal-minority coalition prescribes.

Political Strategy. Coming economic crises and racial disturbances are almost sure to force political responses that will shock and dismay diehard believers in Western democracy. The way each crisis is handled or rather mishandled will strengthen some of the selling points that will eventually serve as weapons in the psychological armory of ethnostates. The following is a tentative list of the more serious issues that the West must successfully cope with if high civilization is to be preserved:

- *Survival.* We no longer have to rely on professional pessimists to detect and explicate the trends that may lead beyond the dispossession of Western man to his extinction. There is more than a bare possibility of a "final solution" in the 21st and 22nd centuries for whites wherever and whenever they decline from majorities to minorities. Of all such whites, Euro-Americans are probably in the greatest danger.
- *Race.* Being attacked as a race, we have no choice but to defend ourselves as a race. To be successful, such a defense must include raising racial morale by a crash course on Western man's greatness, his outstanding role in history, his superb artistic, scientific, economic and political achievements—in sum, his magisterial genetic qualities.

• *History.* The brilliance of Western civilization in past centuries must be compared favorably to the shoddiness of what still passes for high culture in Western countries, with particular reference to the barbarism brought about by the influx of nonwhites into the West's racial heartlands.

• *Morality.* Standards of behavior have sunk so frightfully low that human instincts seem to be yielding to animal instincts. Widely touted and promoted by a corrupt media and a depraved academia, and constantly egged on by uncloseted homosexuals, what amounts to a cultural grab bag of sexual perversions, mind-wrenching drugs, political and financial chicanery, and violent crime is being emptied on the West on a round-the-clock basis.

• *Vengeance.* Many of our setbacks have been caused by a deliberate campaign of retribution by minorities bemused by newly confected ideological histories, some written by their white toadies. Obsessed with revenge for sins, real or imagined, nonwhite avengers are turning many metropolitan areas and close-in suburbs into battlefields.

• *Pride.* No Westerner worth the name wants to be a second-class citizen in what was once his own country. Less than a century ago we were kings of all we surveyed. Now we are the subjects of scatological jokes by columnists and television comedians.

• *Truth.* Western man's achievements rest largely on his fascination with truth. In science, in the arts, he wants to "get it right." Minority rhetoric and denunciations are no substitute for facts.

• *Aesthetics.* Certain concepts of beauty, grace and taste appertain to men and women of Northern European origin. The ugliness and animalism that characterize the rise of a black underclass has instilled a disgust that can be turned into a powerful motivating force for racial rebirth.

All the above issues will become more cogent and compelling as future events unfold. What will delay their catching fire is the sublime ignorance in which even intelligent minds are kept by the media, which report and interpret the decline

of the West in a manner deliberately designed to dull and neutralize any remedial reaction. One solution to the problem of disinformation is the mass distribution of a few key books and pamphlets to unlock the jail cells of ignorance in which so many Westerners have been imprisoned. Countermedia must be nurtured and cultivated to expose the liberal and minority tilt of the mainstream press and television.

Another factor that serves to dampen any immediate and effective response to the serious dilemmas facing the West is cowardice. The average Westerner, even if he understands his people's predicament, is afraid to do anything about it—afraid to join any pro-Western organization, afraid to order and even read pro-Western literature, afraid to speak his mind even to family and friends. He knows what will happen to his livelihood and reputation if he is branded a "racist." The higher his position on the economic, social or political ladder, the harder and more painful would be his fall.

The desire for respectability is one of the greatest hindrances to Western resurgence. Aristocrats and elitists are notorious for their unwillingness to dirty their hands in politics. Many leaders in government, the professions and business, despite their public protestations of affection for the working class, consider themselves so far above the common herd that they would not dream of taking part in riotous public meetings or street demonstrations.

Events, as they unfold, may overcome some of this cowardice, since desperation is a catalyst of courage. Peer pressure will also help to set the stage for action. It is hard for a person to keep hiding his head in the sand when an increasing number of friends and neighbors are lifting up theirs. Joining a group working for a vital cause is a great help in overcoming fear and trembling.

Appeals to reason, however, can only go so far in mobilizing people for concerted action. Appeals to instinct are far more productive. This is why it is more effective to zero in on the social rather than the political errors of opponents, always remembering that people have a greater memory for wrongs than rights.

To enlist sympathy and support we should look to friends, not strangers. In general, we will listen more attentively to a family member than to an acquaintance, more apt to heed a leader who is a paragon of respectability than some "operator." People prefer to work for people they can look up to. They are deathly afraid of pitching in with charlatans. Any politician who has a suspicious past will have to work twice as hard to attract followers as someone with an unblemished résumé.

The prime task of any leader is to inspire people who have been drugged into inaction to act. Proportional representation could be an opening wedge. The more parties, the less chance of repressing political activism. Ethnostatists must learn to practice a political form of jujitsu, the trick of concentrating the superior strength of the opponent against himself.

It is difficult to attack principles without wounding or angering those who espouse them. That is why so few vitally important political or social issues can be resolved peaceably. Ethnostatists must not allow themselves to give up or go soft on a fight because they are occasionally roughed up. To win their battles they must adopt the tactics appropriate to a military operation on unfavorable terrain. No one in an untenable situation should fight for every inch of ground. Like the Roman general, Fabius Cunctator, the smart tactician withdraws, bides his time and awaits a more favorable opportunity.

We distinguish between missionaries who attempt to convert infidels and the infidels themselves. We understand what the men of god are up to. But we do not distinguish between the political missionaries attempting to convert us and ourselves. Consequently, we do not understand their motives, which are anything but pure.

Our best young brains are only beginning to suspect how they are being used and abused. Almost from the first grade our children have been taught that what is right for others is right for them, notwithstanding that the "others" may have a diametrically opposite view of what is or is not right, and act accordingly.

Class war has been a tried and tested way to overthrow a

dominant majority or minority. Would a proletarian revolution be an effective means of establishing ethnostates? Whenever more power and money fall into the grasp of minorities, there is the possibility of a strong backlash from an oppressed majority or an oppressed minority that was once a majority. Secession, however, not revolution, would seem to be the safest, surest, most practical and least violent way to bring an ethnostate into being.

A Word to Americans. The basic political strategy for the ethnostate movement in America should be to channel the frustrations of majority Americans into building dynamic political organizations. No longer should the two major parties be allowed to get away with the pretense of representing mainstream America, which, no matter what the political seers and commentators say, is a racial group whose members are limited to Americans of European (mainly Northern European) descent. As such, majority Americans in the vernacular of physical anthropology, are preponderantly Nordic and Alpine in race. Since race is the ultimate binding force of political activism, majority Americans must be the genetic mainstay of ethnostate movements in the United States. The tergiversating white politicians who try to deny and get around this basic demographic fact should be treated with the contempt reserved for prevaricators and the opprobrium reserved for enemies.

We must not only learn to know who our friends are, but after knowing them, we must educate, enlighten and inspirit them. We must also come to the unhappy conclusion that all those who look like us and are our racial cousins are not to be automatically trusted. There are still far too many rewards for betrayal, far too much thought-molding and mind-bending going on for all majority Americans to develop a healthy immunity to liberal and minority agitprop.

Educate, arouse, act! These are the well-worn stepping-stones to power. But they should be traversed in that order. Arousal before education, acting before being properly aroused are invitations to failure. Misplaced priorities do not set the stage for momentous deeds.

Reformists. The profession of reformer is an attractive one, mainly because it hinges more on promises than results. Enjoying the same special dispensation from proof accorded the preacher who offers his congregation immortality, the reformer specializes in projecting unprovable and untestable visions of a better life. He is applauded or tolerated, even if he advocates changing what does not need to be changed and overlooks, deliberately or not, the faults in the social order that cry out for correction. The arguments and emotions are all on the side of the person who stirs things up, not the person who wants calm and recommends thinking twice before jumping.

As for the sincerity and honesty of the reformer, these questions should be asked: Is he for reform because he really wants to improve the people's lot, or is he driven by some inner compulsion that has nothing to do with principle but much to do with ego? Would he be politicking just as hard and promising just as much in a perfect society as in a perfectly awful society? Would he shift his principles 180 degrees and argue for entirely different reforms in a state that had enacted into law all his previous demands and recommendations? Such questions come to mind whenever someone is making a profession of shouting (the demagogue) or whispering (the conspirator) that the world or his country is falling apart and that people must do such and such instanter or perish.

Deep Politics. Western political science, like its progenitor, Western culture, is the gift of the gifted to the ungifted. A few Westerners of superior character and strength of mind are responsible for almost everything positive that the West has accomplished in the field of politics. All the democracy, all the leveling, all the egalitarianism in the world cannot make strong what is inherently weak. Put the weak in charge, as is now being done throughout the West, and soon there will be little to take charge of.

Genes have set the stage for high politics by giving a few men the capability of creating what most are incapable of creating—advanced forms of government. Westerners should be thankful for and listen to such men.

What we see around us today is not so much decadence as the disappearance of strong minds from the political forum and the pitiful attempts of weak minds to manage what they are powerless to manage.

The heroes of history are the men who lift their people out of a morass of anarchy and social chaos and set the stage for a brilliant efflorescence of human activity. Ethnostates need heroic founding fathers whose labors will transform, possibly even transfigure, world politics.

There is little profit in opposing and attacking the pluralistic nation state with appeals to tradition and old-fashioned Western values. Aphorisms like "fair play" and "an honest day's work for an honest dollar" permeated the West when it was composed of a largely monoracial (white) substrate of the world population. Today, these values have all but disappeared in clouds of deceit and hypocrisy. Before they can have any real meaning and influence again, we must slough off the moral confusion foisted upon us by different cultural norms.

There is scant room for 19th-century Western moral standards in the beleaguered late 20th-century West. To survive we must return to the basic and much older values of survival, which predominated in the beginnings of Western civilization. The time has come to break out of the liberal mind-set, which triggered so many of the West's cultural marvels, but which is now hopelessly out of date and busy destroying what it so brilliantly created. In all too many ways the modern Westerner is being programmed to deal with a world that no longer exists. Such a perverse education can only have disastrous psychological effects on the good minds who know what should be done, but also know that merely by advancing a few sensible proposals, they will be viewed as heretics and given the silent treatment or overt animus meted out to maverick thinkers throughout the ages. Overcoming a hostile intellectual atmosphere requires the kind of courage that is always in short supply.

Narrowing the Schism. It is the nature of the liberal to be forever anxious to help someone or something. In a multi-

racial state he is in his element because there are always one or more population groups that can be classified as needy. Also in a perpetual state of need are many foreign nations. Third World countries are forever on the edge of famine or bankruptcy.

If he is rich, the liberal will donate money to the disadvantaged both at home and abroad. If he is an intellectual, while agitating for the poor, he will often use them as pawns for his own ideological and political ends. In times of prosperity welfare becomes a growth industry that offers professional liberals cushy, well-paying jobs in foundations and various charitable organizations. In bad times, as government concentrates its attention on poverty and unemployment, liberal activity increases exponentially, and altruism, the liberal's overriding instinct, moves into high gear.

In a multiracial state the last people to get the attention of the liberal are often his own people. His surfeit of other-caring may drive him to dwell on the problems of those who are as far removed from him as possible—racially and culturally. What appears to be the liberal's cold, unfeeling abandonment of his own fellow citizens often provokes a conservative or nationalist backlash that creates a schism in the body politic.

The ethnostate, being monoracial and isolationist, would force the liberal to focus his altruism on his own kind. Reducing foreign aid might in the short run cause additional suffering in the poorer areas of the world, but at least it would encourage these countries to solve their own problems instead of relying eternally on outsiders, a practice which, if continued indefinitely, would augment rather than decrease their poverty.

Without the racial agitation traditionally stirred up by liberalism's pandering to minorities, domestic tranquillity would be given an important boost. Also, liberals themselves become more respected and more liked when it becomes known they are targeting their goodwill and their good money on the home folks.

When liberals win the trust of the public, their conservative opponents lose much of their political ammunition. The right can no longer accuse the left of wasting the resources of the

state on aid to minorities at home and "underdeveloped" nations abroad. Accordingly, politics becomes more genteel and has a better chance of becoming constructive, as a main cause of internal dissension disappears.

It can be safely predicted that liberalism in an ethnostate would bear a much closer resemblance to the classical liberalism of the 19th century than to the other-directed, intolerant hyper-liberalism of the latter half of the 20th century.

The ethnostate, designed and constituted to require minimal government, would also exert a soothing influence on modern conservatives, who in their contemporary incarnation are uncomfortable with excessive governmental supervision and control. They are also tired of being accused of racism, because they instinctively and without malice aforethought veer towards the manners and mores of the dominant population group. In a monoracial state they could hardly be charged with indulging in racial discrimination. Once the big guns of racism are spiked, politicians would be restricted to arguing about nonracial matters. Under such favorable conditions a few government leaders might actually become statesmen.

Since nothing is more wasteful of time and energy in contemporary politics than the constant sniping that goes on between liberals and conservatives, even the slightest reduction in this noise level will be an immense boon to the art of government.

Race and State. In his book, *North and South: An African Journey,* Shiva Naipaul, an Asian Indian from Trinidad, writes of blacks and whites in South Africa: "Both were rotten to the core. Each had been destroyed by contact with each other." No one has described the effect of racial interfacing more bluntly.

The bos'n's envy of Billy Budd's innate saintliness and physical attractiveness in Herman Melville's novella resonates with racial undertones. Few authors have been more successful in delineating the ambivalent attitudes of the dark to the fair, the nonwhite to the white, the disadvantaged races towards the advantaged. The comparisons subtly alluded to by Melville

offer many clues to the revolutionary excesses of this and past centuries. Envy exists even when races are separated, but not to the dangerous extent it reaches when races live side by side. As Max Scheler has pointed out so forcefully, resentment is at the heart of modern egalitarian doctrine.

A distinct trait of Northern Europeans is that so many of them are civilized nomads. In Viking days their ships were their homes. Today, with their vacation houses and RVs, they are a race whose roots are wheels. After exploration, migration, conquest and settlement, will they ever acknowledge that civilization requires staying put?

Like the life of an individual, the life of a species (or race) has a beginning and an end. Like an individual, a species should have a mission, a reason for being.

The mission of the individual is to procreate, to keep the species alive and kicking. The goal of the species should be to fulfill its collective potential, to prepare the way for an uptick in evolutionary grade. A goal-less existence is as static and unproductive as death. The combined intensity of the life of the individual and the group is the true measure of life.

Leaders of an ethnostate should never allow its population to sleep, to rest on its oars. Since it is easier to whip a homogeneous population into shape than to activate a mixing bowl of different and often mutually hostile races and subraces, the dynamic states of the future are more likely to be ethnostates than to be motley empires and multiracial nations where so much human energy is dissipated in internecine feuding.

Chapter 7

Social Progress

An Aristocracy of Merit. If we delve deeply enough into the etymology of *aristos* (the best) and *kratos* (rule), we can safely say an aristocracy that is not at the helm of the state is not living up to its responsibilities and is missing its rendezvous with destiny. "Rule" should be as integral a part of aristocracy as "best." Since Western aristocracies are few and far between in the last decade of the 20th century and, since where they do exist they cannot or will not rule, it is fair to ask, what is their *raison d'être*? Willy-nilly our modern aristocrats seem to have deliberately placed themselves in the vanguard of the West's march to degeneracy. Instead of ruling, they furnish the worst sort of example by going somewhat faster than *hoi polloi* in scuttling the standards of morality and behavior required to keep countries in one piece.

Roughly defined, modern aristocrats tend to be people with some breeding and family lineage who consistently go "public" in the tabloids and gossip columns. Were it not for their resplendent family histories, hardly anyone would ever hear of them and their infantile antics. Owing largely to the glamor accorded the well-born by the media, many less exalted folk are persuaded to imitate what they conceive to be aristocratic lifestyles. The precious few aristocrats who do have a desire to avoid the limelight should be complimented on their modesty, provided it is not a ploy to conceal their decadence.

No one who has not come down with brain fever or demo-

cratic dogmatitis should find fault with the statement that the rule of the best is the best of all possible rules. The difficulty is how to provide the right political and social environment for the best among us to attain positions of leadership, when the political version of Gresham's Law is in effect. The illiterate party "enforcers," the duplicitous fixers and the professional deal makers who claw their way to power in modern democracies may have a few virtues, but their far greater number of vices generally includes an inordinate dislike of their betters, which often metastasizes into plans for eliminating them as fast as possible.

Once upon a time, aristocracies arose from a warrior class. To win vast estates in battle and have their possession confirmed by pope, king or feudal lord demanded a large infusion of physical courage, brainpower and leadership capabilities. In one or two generations it was quite possible for the descendants of such outstanding men to become the genuine article: functioning, well-oiled aristocrats.

Classes and races are organisms, as are human beings. The two former simply run on a more extended timetable, the life cycle of races lasting much longer than that of classes. Unfortunately, it does not take too many generations for aristocrats, who are easily spoiled from birth, to degenerate into the opposites of their ancestors.

Since a hierarchical social order, one of the chief prerequisites of an aristocracy of birth, is hard to find nowadays, we must concentrate on preparing the way for that other category of rule by the best, an aristocracy of merit. In this endeavor the ethnostate could play a starring role. Multiracial states, like all states, democratic or authoritarian, are ruled by elites. When two elites are present in the same state at the same time, a struggle for power is inevitable. In a multiracial state the clash of elites is likely to be between elites of different races; in ethnostates no such racial confrontations would be possible. What is more, the ethnostate offers little opportunity for the growth of several religious elites. Monoracial states tend to have a bare minimum of squabbling religious denominations, and even universal religions and their various denominations

are usually ruled and directed by a race-conscious hierarchy.

Because of the diversity of its elites, a multiracial state is usually ruled by an "in" elite which differs significantly culturally and racially, not only from one or more "out" elites, but from large segments of the population. The cultural discord arising from this situation soon becomes pervasive, as those with entirely different customs and behavior patterns try to adopt or are forced to adopt the ways of the ruling elite. Nothing is a more effective promoter of dissension and civil strife than the elite of one race ruling masses of people of a different race.

An aristocracy of merit will help dampen man's traditional envy of privileged classes—a justifiable envy when a decadent aristocracy of birth squanders its inheritance. Conversely, only the most spiteful will resent those who have earned, not been handed, their generous rewards and perquisites. A ruling class selected on the basis of achievement, the bulk of whose members changes with each generation, will be viewed entirely differently than a class founded on hereditary privilege. With no racial differences and no petrified class structure, the ethnostate would give its citizens less cause for divisive infighting.

Aristocrats being the traditional guardians of culture, it is the duty and responsibility of the ethnostate to search out this special breed and make as many aristocrats of merit as possible out of its gifted citizens. Most aristocrats to the manor born would probably not get anywhere without the manor. The aristocrat of merit needs help to acquire aristocratic tastes, manners and tone as he works his way up the social ladder.

The Cant Factor. Whether we like it or not, hypocrisy has been an important factor, a sort of saving grace, in keeping Western civilization alive. If we had really believed in and acted on the political fancies of prominent philosophers, political scientists and religionists, we should long ago have been reduced to perpetual anarchy. An unstructured, non-hegemonic society cannot function over time, any more than an army can put up a good fight without an officer corps. Whenever men, even in small numbers, get together or are

crowded together, different gradations of power and influence quickly emerge. People may be treated equally by law, but in everyday life, on the social plane where men both work for and against each other, inequality not equality is the order of the day.

Many of us believe or pretend to believe in the tenets of Christianity and support various churches with our donations (less frequently with our attendance). At the same time, how many of our thoughts and acts contradict Christian doctrine! We thrive on vengeance. We covet not only our neighbor's land, but whole countries, some of which we manage to conquer by a process snidely defined as "pacification." Jesus commanded us to be meek, but if we had been the kind of people to tie ourselves to apron strings, we would never have crossed oceans to discover new worlds or soared into space to explore the solar system.

Strange to say, we should be thankful we say one thing and do another. If we had followed the religious road map that laid out the shortest and surest way to heaven, we would long ago have become lost. Setting impossible goals of saintly behavior seems to be a relatively innocuous habit. What brings us down to earth is an instinctive red light that tells us when to stop, sober up and "get with it."

Religion, faith and creed propel us to the emotional highs that allow us to think more highly of ourselves, to pretend we are better than we are or can ever hope to be. If we did not indulge in these false self-assessments, if we were not unbearably hypocritical in our day-to-day existence, our ranks would be decimated by suicides and dominated by neurotics.

Both the necessity and the opportunity for political, religious and social preening would be diminished in an ethnostate. It is generally a waste of time to put on an act in front of your neighbor, to pose and attitudinize where your career and your character are both experientially and intuitively known to people who share your own racial and cultural background.

Our reliance on hypocrisy to handle some of the more difficult social problems would quickly diminish in a milieu where frantic and exaggerated appeals to liberty, equality and frater-

nity would no longer be needed to pump up an artificial spirit of community among disparate and often hostile population groups. Men and women living among their own kind need less urging to work together for the common good. The mediators, ombudsmen and minority spokesmen who proliferate in heterogeneous societies would not have much of a calling in an ethnostate. Without the presence of these self-appointed social repairmen, the citizenry would enjoy more domestic peace and tranquillity, and suffer less domestic turmoil.

In view of the logic and common sense embedded in the concept of the ethnostate, there is no particular reason why truth and straight talk would eventually eliminate much of the cant that obfuscates contemporary political and social discourse.

Urbs and Suburbs. The descent into barbarism of many great Western cities is the all but certain consequence of confining a welter of different races in what amounts to an asphalt and concrete wasteland. The further living conditions move away from the environment that human beings have been accustomed to for thousands of generations, the more inhuman the environment and its occupants become. Increasingly, the inhabitants of large cities must resort to the school-of-fish technique for survival. By bunching up, most are able to escape, while the unlucky ones who find themselves on the periphery are picked off.

The modern city should not only be planned architecturally; it should be planned demographically. Urban areas that welcome people of every culture and race stand a good chance of becoming ethnic battlefields. In comparison, the cities of ethnostates would be populated by the same kind of people that inhabit the suburban and rural areas. Racial friction should disappear practically overnight, which means that a principal cause of urban violence would disappear. What is more, as a result of the high technology that now brings so many of the advantages of urban living to the most remote hamlets, cities would no longer need to be as large and crowded as in the past. The same conveniences that not so long

ago were only at the disposal of city dwellers are now available almost everywhere.

The dirt, noise and flat-out junglification of the late 20th-century megalopolis can be avoided, though perhaps only briefly, by moving to the suburbs and beyond, as tens of millions have done and continue to do. But if the same proportionate mix of races makes the move, it will not be long before suburbia resembles the metropolitan racial miasma the escapees left behind. The one effective answer to these waves of outmigration is monoracialism, which assures that the inhabitants of cities, suburbs and countryside will be racially and culturally compatible.

The Communications Block. The exponential advance of communications and transportation networks has made racial separatism harder to come by. That a wide expanse of territory was needed to sustain man in the hunter-gatherer stage of human evolution ensured geographic distancing. Since this territory provided the wherewithal for life, it had to be protected against poachers and other assorted trespassers.

The advent of organized agriculture made it possible for both invaders and defenders to live off the land they once fought for. Refugees, uprooted by famine or conquest, could be housed and fed. Today, vast masses of people can move to Western countries without missing a meal. Most will be well-nourished and provided for until they settle down, get jobs and, in ever increasing numbers, intermarry with their hosts. The network of modern communications not only makes it possible to prepare for such population shifts; it also conditions the host population to accept migrants. Racial and cultural integration is accelerated by the media's refusal to explore racial differences.

Men and women generally need 25 years or so of grammar school, high school, college and graduate school for a degree that qualifies them to take a comprehensive examination that, if passed, bestows on them the right to practice law or medicine. Dentists, actuaries and commercial aviation pilots all must study and be tested for years before they can become

full-fledged members of their professions. Yet a television anchorman speaking to 15 or 20 million viewers five nights a week, a man whose slightest vocal inflection may shape the opinions of a huge and credulous audience, whose tossed-off comments and asides can have a profound effect on domestic and foreign policy, may know next to nothing of the history of his own or, for that matter, of any other nation.

Once he drops out of or graduates from college (some of his species never even make it to college), the anchorman never has to take an examination to test his knowledge of world affairs. In fact, his only qualification for his immensely influential job may be a leaning towards modern liberalism, which may be prompted more by his wallet than by any real conviction. Add a dash of sex appeal and an obsessive ambition to be an overpaid celebrity and you have the Brokaws, Jenningses and Rathers of A.D. 1992. Such a shallow and inappropriate background makes it difficult for anyone hired to report the news to really understand the news. Part ignoramus, part windbag, the anchorman has no qualms about further slanting the already slanted material that streams across his teleprompter.

No occupation is more important in this age of instant global communications than that of the electronic journalist, who can inch nations into war, raise class and racial antagonisms to a boil and bring down presidents. Most TV newsmen, knowing their power, cannot help but let it go to their heads. They have only contempt for the few critics who accuse them of not having the foggiest notion of the consequences of their thoughtless reporting.

Since he comments so often about economic issues, inflation, unemployment, foreign affairs and the like, it would only seem logical that the electronic journalist should know whereof he speaks. We cannot expect him to have more than a sketchy knowledge of the physical sciences, but surely if he deals with domestic politics and world affairs on a daily basis and if millions of his viewers accept him as an authority on a vast range of subjects, he should have more than a passing acquaintance with economics, history and political science.

When it is suggested that television anchormen, foreign correspondents, newspaper columnists and editorial writers be required to demonstrate some knowledge of the issues they discuss so glibly, when it is recommended that they take a yearly examination or refresher course on the subjects on which they pretend to be experts, they and their employers start referring to the First Amendment. Is it chilling or killing free speech to ask that people in the news business prove they are qualified for their jobs, as members of most other professions must do?

Uneducated or undereducated mediacrats often try to hide their ignorance by emitting a smokescreen of democratic pieties and platitudes. They attempt to blur their ax-grinding by describing it as adversary journalism, which is better described as superficial journalism. All too frequently news items are selected for their confrontational content instead of their importance. The minds and voices predominant in such argumentative arenas are not disposed to get behind the headlines but to write them. News that contradicts prevailing dogmas is often ignored, because words often fail an ideologue forced to come to grips with facts that belie his ideology.

If we are intelligent, why can't we act intelligently? One reason is that too many people in the seats of power do not wish us to act intelligently. It would throw sand in their *modus operandi*. They want us to act in a way that may be intelligent to them, but not intelligent for us.

Progress for us will remain on hold until we learn how to get through to our own people and manage to bypass those who are dedicated to preventing us from getting through. It all adds up to a problem of communications. For some groups misinformation and disinformation are not faults or sins; they are a way of life. Many of us are still so naive we refuse to believe that round-the-clock prevaricators do not have twinges of conscience; that the news twisters actually consider fudging the news a virtue—a blow struck against the enemy.

Crime Prevention. People are more hesitant to commit unlawful acts against their own kind than against outsiders.

They feel less guilty, less conscience-stricken about doing harm to someone not "one of them." This attitude helps account for the survival over the centuries of population groups that have traditionally cut corners in nations to which they have felt no particular allegiance.

Certain crimes yield certain advantages to groups that commit them on an organized and routine basis. Some of this disregard for the social order may actually become congenital since it has worked to the advantage of selfish beneficiaries for many generations. Vociferous members of such "families" will point to the numerous times they have collectively suffered for this aberrant behavior. Nevertheless, these groups or gangs are still around in one form or another and still in business.

Trial by jury may have arisen in part out of distrust for one's fellow man or, more precisely, one particular fellow man, the judge. Several men—inexpert in the law—were deemed more trustworthy than lawyers, who in olden days were both judge and jury. Some of this distrust was probably provoked by class divisions. Judges and the courtroom's retinue of attorneys, not always deservedly, have habitually loomed well above the ordinary citizen in the Western pecking order.

In multiracial nations the jury can be a stumbling block to the criminal justice system rather than a neutral participant. A juror of one race may be psychologically impelled to side with a defendant of the same race against a prosecutor of another race. Many millions of dollars and thousands of hours have been wasted in trials that have ended with hung juries that split along racial lines.

There will be no racially mixed juries in the ethnostate. The court system will earn more public trust and confidence when judges, prosecutors and defense attorneys are of the same racial and cultural background as the accused. Since there can be no racially inspired crime in a monoracial society, no racial interference with the natural flow of the legal process will cloud the judgment of judge and jury.

Looking into the future, we might see a time when morality

largely replaces legality. A higher type of man, one with a plethora of ethical strands in his DNA, need not be told what is right. He should know what is right and be trusted to do what is right. On that bright and promising day the legal profession and the judiciary, basically parasites on the body politic, might begin to close down.

No matter how loudly present-day criminologists may deny it or laugh it off, crime has a direct effect on human evolution. When violent criminals are freed after serving only a fraction of their jail time, they have a greater chance of passing on their genes than if kept under lock and key. To allow the carrier of the XYY chromosome (a genetic marker for criminal tendencies) to have children is not a good way to lower the crime rate. Even the most zealous nurturist would agree that giving habitual criminals the freedom to reproduce, occasionally with females who are also criminals, does little to raise the quality of the world's gene pool.

Conservation. No one should view the ethnostate concept more favorably than the conservationist. The ethnostate will not only try to conserve all its flora and fauna; it will also pay particular attention to saving that most endangered of all fauna—*Homo sapiens*.

The words "conservation" and "conservative" have a similar ring, but a dissimilar meaning. A conservative in today's vernacular is a free-market, supply-side, small government advocate who, when the chips are down, puts the individual above the group, even his own group. Modern conservatism has little in common with classical conservatism, which gave race and culture a much higher priority than economics. The "little government" leanings of most modern conservatives are a plus, but their crass materialism and their pusillanimous refusal to discuss the race issue are a definite minus.

A conservationist seeks a proper balance between civilization and environment. The love of nature is second nature to him. He is more interested in clean air than in the "good life" of produce and consume. If there is one person who should be in the vanguard of ethnostatism, it is the conservationist.

Mens Sana in Corpore Sano. Medicine was once a holy profession. In the present-day West it is largely in the hands of avaricious physicians who bank small fortunes while their patients line up like cattle to be prodded into prohibitively expensive tests and treatments. Some of this unmerited wealth is taken away by costly malpractice suits, which enrich ambulance-chasing lawyers and send insurance costs through the roof. In the end, however, it is the patient who is the big loser.

Races and subraces are predisposed to certain diseases and have different incidences of inherited defects. The physician in the ethnostate would be able to concentrate on the sicknesses of his own people and would not have to specialize in the treatment of diseases, often exotic diseases, infecting people of different races. The medical profession in each ethnostate can concentrate on the unique health problems of the citizenry. Such specialization, accompanied by the allocation of adequate resources, should not only result in checking the spread of disease but go a long way towards implementing Juvenal's famous aphorism about sound minds in sound bodies.

The best mechanic for any particular type of automobile is likely to be the one who worked in the factory that manufactured it. The same may be said for those who are chosen to repair the human body. The doctor most likely to be familiar with the health problems of his patients is the doctor who is their neighbor and shares their skin color. The family doctor, alas, is long gone, and the ethnostate may not be able to bring him back. But it can offer the next best thing: the doctor who knows and empathizes with his people.

As for diet, which can work both wonders and horrors, the peoples whose ancestors have lived on a specific territory for generations are best nourished by the food native to that territory. Over the centuries, particular vegetables, meats and grains have established a sort of healthy symbiosis with indigenous populations. Permanent changes of diet and complications caused by exotic or unfamiliar foods may produce harmful physical and mental aberrations that will take generations to assess and correct.

Medical care is one thing; providing expensive organ trans-

plants to everyone who needs one is another. The main goal of medicine should be to improve the health of people, not to keep the terminally ill alive indefinitely. By quarantining AIDS carriers, by forbidding procreation to those with serious hereditary defects and by aborting the offspring of single welfare mothers, the cost of health care for the overall population could be brought down to where all-inclusive, womb-to-tomb medical insurance would be affordable.

The Population Problem. One of the more unsettling aspects of the modern era is the radically different population policies of the developed and underdeveloped nations. The demographic strategy of the developed nations is to lower birthrates and prevent population growth. The demographic strategy of most Third World countries, government proclamations to the contrary, is simply to breed with little or no heed to the future. When these two different strategies clash, as they often do in the multiracial nations of the West, discord and disruption ripples up and down the state. Since the explosion of the black and Hispanic population, either through high birthrates or immigration, is partly funded by welfare, the number of those living on public handouts is constantly climbing. As the ranks of white majorities thin in the Western nations, it becomes more difficult to resist the economic and political demands of the proliferating blacks and Hispanics, who maintain an irrational belief in the power of numbers. The subsequent destabilization cannot avoid weakening the West's external defenses. It is no secret that instability at home invites aggression from abroad.

Multiracial states are not noted for long-time stability. Those undergoing significant population shifts in relatively short periods of time are arguably the most unstable of all. There are few, if any, examples in history where large population groups of sharply different racial and cultural backgrounds, living side by side in the same country, have been able to pursue radically different population strategies peacefully for more than a few generations. Since it is politically impossible for democratic governments to enact laws that make failure to

reduce birthrates a crime, there seems to be no painless way to reduce minority child-bearing. The mere suggestion that blacks in America and elsewhere should lower their birthrate to the present negative replacement level of whites would be denounced as a form of state-sponsored genocide. Whites would be accused of attempting to cling to power by the mass murder of nonwhite babies.

Government-regulated birthrates are possible, however, in a monoracial state, as demonstrated by recent legislation in China. In monoracial states no racial resentment could be aroused on this subject because population control would affect only one race. In China the one-child program conflicts with the traditional habit of the Chinese, particularly farm families, to put a premium on sons. If the only child is female, parents are strongly motivated to ignore the law and try for a male. The families that have only daughters bear a lot of resentment towards the Marxist mandarins in Beijing. But the resentment is familial, not racial.

Today, almost every country in the world is either overpopulated or on the verge of having its population exceed its resources. It follows that the population policies, or lack of same, of the underdeveloped nations and their migrant populations in the West are spurs to ecological and demographic disaster. One commonsensical way to stop this rush to chaos would be to reorganize the world into ethnostates, which would eliminate many of the within-state, race-based objections to population control. Once the ethnostate rule of minimal foreign aid is in place, proliferating populations would know in advance that their demographic transgressions would not be forgiven. No more food shipments, grants and loans from the First World would be forthcoming, except in dire emergencies. Any attempt by the high birthrate nations to solve their population problems by exporting their human surplus would be prohibited by strict immigration laws.

Because of disparate birthrates, because nonwhite populations are expanding almost everywhere, while white populations are diminishing almost everywhere, the ethnostate offers not only a solution to the population problem, but also a solu-

tion to the growing disproportion of whites and nonwhites worldwide. It is perhaps in this area, the area of defusing the population bomb and rectifying the fertility imbalance of the races, that the ethnostate could be of greatest service to human progress.

In multiracial states birthrates, as indicated previously, are often associated with the struggle for power. It is hardly a surprise that birth control programs and family planning are viewed with suspicion by large segments of the population. The sense of community, which can be relied upon to encourage a racially and culturally unified citizenry to accept population control, is never as strong and never as effective in a multiracial as in a monoracial state.

More important than human numbers is human quality. One way of raising the average intelligence of a people is to get parents with high IQs to have more children than low-IQ parents. In a multiracial state, where IQ scores vary not only among individuals but among races and subraces, such a proposal, which would be damned from day one as Hitlerian, would arouse so much controversy it would be tantamount to political suicide to support it. In the United States, Negroes and Hispanics have disproportionately low-IQ scores compared to whites and Asians, while whites of Northern European extraction have, on average, higher IQs than people of Southern European extraction. It is obvious that, if high-IQ couples were persuaded to have large families, the proportion of the Northern European and Asian populations would increase.

Owing to modern medicine, welfare and differential birthrates, the less intelligent are now surviving in greater numbers than the more intelligent. If we ever reach the point where we can experiment with eugenics to compensate for the decline of natural selection as a means of weeding out the unfit, ethnostates would be ideal laboratories. Various types of population enhancement, including eugenics, could be tested and evaluated in one or two ethnostates without worldwide repercussions.

Because many of the more ingenious theories of political science and mass behavior have seldom been tested under

properly controlled conditions, they have usually remained just that—theories. The ethnostate would make it possible to put some badly needed science into the social sciences. Using one or two ethnostates as testing grounds for new forms of government might do more to advance the human condition than all the books, speeches, manifestos and preachments of a thousand political philosophers, statesmen and media magnates.

Immigration, a topic previously discussed in this study, is an important part of the population problem. Not only armies, but individuals and families move across borders. Although the mills of the gods of genetics grind slowly, it is undeniable that gene mixing is the most effective and irreversible form of cultural change. When the gene pool changes, the culture changes and, when the culture changes, the state changes.

Any state or people that desires to preserve its racial and cultural inheritance should put heavy restrictions on immigration. Xenophilia should not be the order of the day. The influx and efflux of trade representatives, diplomats, educators, reporters, missionaries, entertainers and refugees should be kept to a reasonable minimum. It is the first law of race-mixing that the more foreigners and aliens there are in a country, the greater the rate of miscegenation. Because of the homogeneity of its people, the ethnostate should not have to enact laws against intermarriage, though abortion should be mandatory in the rare cases where mixed-race pregnancies occur. As for child-rearing, which often fails disastrously in female-headed families, pregnancies unaccompanied by a marriage certificate should not be allowed to come to term.

Chapter 8

Maverick Economics

The Clash of Class. The most divisive man who walks the earth is the professional proletarian. Lauding and drooling over "workers," he heaps so much scorn and contumely on his betters—managers, entrepreneurs, achievers—that the ensuing class hatred is easily blown up into time-wasting sit-ins, violence-ridden strikes, bloody street brawls, even revolution. In short, the class warrior, though he pretends to be concerned with economic disparities, lives and breathes the politics of envy.

Unlike Marxist and Leninist proletarianism, populism sits well with a homogeneous work force because it includes in its platform share-the-wealth planks attractive to both blue- and white-collar workers, who have become half-deaf to cultural and patriotic appeals. Populism, however, can be counterproductive when it harps too long and too hard on "soak the rich" and "capitalist conspiracy" themes. Too much of this oratory only further divides a population group that has lost its way, often at the very time it is most in need of unity.

Hatred and envy for the super-rich of one's own people, especially for those who made their fortunes by money juggling and speculation, is understandable. Even saints have been known to resent those who have accumulated a large surplus of material goods with relatively little perspiration. Not many poor people being able to make it through life without blaming their penury on the "system" and without envying

those who are better off than themselves, class agitators have an audience that is all ears and eager to listen to conspiracy mongers who specialize in splenetic spitefulness and inordinate use of the *ad hominem.*

In some respects it would be advantageous to have the leader of an ethnostate come from the upper classes. Notwithstanding his faults, he would have a smaller residue of envy than someone from the lower rungs of the social ladder. Like it or not, an aristocrat is often able to fascinate and attract working families with a style and tone that confer a metaphysical aura of leadership. On the minus side, he often has difficulty speaking the average citizen's language and understanding his material and spiritual needs.

Since it would eliminate the racial elements in class stratification, the ethnostate would not be overburdened with Marxist and socialist disputations. The money gluttons of Wall Street and Hollywood would no longer be able to amass tens of millions of dollars for a few weeks or months of "work," while the genuine producers of wealth—the manufacturers, inventors, workmen and farmers—have to sweat for their pay.

If the inheritors of great wealth and the accumulators of honest millions put themselves and their Treasury Notes, Certificates of Deposit and gilt-edge securities to work not for the betterment of mankind—that limpid abstraction—but for the benefit of their own people, they are to be saluted. Otherwise their unearned fortunes should be swiftly taxed away. Nothing destroys a hardworking person's morale faster than reading or hearing day after day about the decadent doings of wastrels, who devote most of their worthless existence to mimicking the ancient Sybarites.

Self-Sufficiency. The economies of the developed nations are so complex and so unfathomable that no one seems to have a clue as to what to do about the chronic waves of unemployment, the irresistible overspending and budget deficits, the cyclic bouts of galloping inflation and, in the case of the United States, the enormous trade imbalances. And, all the while, the developed nations overlend and the undeveloped

nations overborrow.

Tiptoeing warily through the uncharted minefield of financial hazards, Western economists habitually turn their eyes away from home, fretting more about the "world picture" than about what is happening in the factory on the outskirts of town. To them economics is little more than a spreadsheet of coded numbers which, properly deciphered, will lead the huddled masses into a promised land of eternal plenty. A more realistic interpretation is that economics at its present stage can be compared to a watch that has so many parts it is never able to keep accurate time.

An ethnostate will have its own unique economy, just as it will have its own unique literature, art and music. A global economy, so much revered by free traders, reduces and shrinks cultural differences by influencing countries everywhere to adopt the current Western system of production and distribution—a system which tolerates and even encourages the economy of scale (the bigger the company, the quicker it can bankrupt its competitors). The effect is to make the inhabitants of countries locked into this economic system imitate the culture, manners and mores of the inventors and perpetrators of what has become a global economy. The fact that people perform much better in an economy tailored to their own ways and predispositions is almost completely ignored.

The economic mess in the Third World presents irrefutable evidence of the danger of inflicting alien work habits on indigenous populations. The exploitation of some of the earth's most precious resources—minerals, rain forests, wetlands—would never have reached its present extent if those whose resources are being squandered had been allowed to solve their own economic problems in their own traditional way. If economies do not have a racial and cultural underpinning, they are ultimately life-destroying instead of life-enriching. What makes the situation worse is that economics is that aspect of culture which can most easily stray across frontiers and become distorted and perverted.

The first step towards a viable economy for any state is self-sufficiency. The old watchword, "export or die," should be

replaced by the more realistic maxim, "export *and* die." If a state cannot manage to get along without depending on foreign products for its bare subsistence, then its citizens will never really taste the freedom and attain the self-reliance that make for a fully rounded human personality.

The economy of ethnostates would be varied enough to give their citizens the broadest opportunities to learn and perform the many different tasks that lead to self-sufficiency. The biggest deterrent to such a program is a one-crop or a one-product economy, which puts the entire economy at the mercy of some destructive microbe and/or the vagaries of foreign competitors.

Economics should be the science of effectively adapting the environment to the needs of varying population groups in varying geographical and climatic settings. As alluded to earlier, economics is far from scientific and is barely more than a potpourri of often totally contradictory doctrines and dogmata.

Economic self-sufficiency puts an end to the age-old game in which the country with lower wage scales and production costs takes over (steals) a large share of the domestic market of the less competitive country. Ethnostates with high wage scales and high operating costs would not have to erect high tariff walls or come up with large subsidies to protect their industry and agriculture. A high priority on self-sufficiency and tight controls on both exports and imports would be enough to safeguard the home economy.

Some ethnostates will be high-tech, some low-tech. The lure of high-tech products will always be a big problem to less developed societies. To obtain the TV sets, cars and kitchenware the poor countries desire, they borrow money they can never repay. The only real and enduring solution is barter—so much agricultural produce for so many manufactured goods, and then only on a case-by-case basis. In the interim, leaders of Third World ethnostates should do everything in their power to persuade their peoples to acquire the knowledge and training to produce what they decide they cannot do without. At the same time, it does no harm to play up the importance of

life's intangibles to those who have difficulty obtaining the tangibles. High civilizations have existed without microwave ovens. Those societies which prefer metaphysics to physics, intangibles to tangibles should be encouraged to concentrate on these preferences.

Security from bullying by powerfully armed or fat-walleted outsiders is the one *gift* that should be bestowed on less advanced and less affluent ethnostates. Regional or continental economic commissions should no longer be primarily concerned with overcoming hindrances to the association of peoples and states, but with overcoming hindrances to dissociation.

Autarky, defined in the dictionary as "a policy of establishing a self-sufficient and independent state economy," is a suspect term in the globalists' lexicon. It should be an honored word in the vocabulary of ethnostatists. Economic independence leads to a well-rounded state and to a well-rounded citizenry.

Too much focus on occupation and occupational status can saddle a state with a caste system. Everyone in an ethnostate should have an equal shot at being what he would like to be. But after getting that chance he should not be given it again and again, only to fail again and again. All the affirmative action and reverse discrimination in the world will not make a brain surgeon out of someone whose capabilities are strained by holding down a job as a trash collector.

State self-sufficiency brings with it an important boost in personal self-sufficiency. A state whose economic existence is narrowly based on the export of one or two raw materials is likely to have a narrow-minded, one-dimensional population and government. Garrett Hardin, one of the few truly imaginative American social scientists, has propounded this excellent rule: "Never do any one thing." Self-sufficiency at both the state and personal level mandates doing "many things." The leitmotiv of ethnostate economics should be "Thou Shalt Not Overspecialize."

No state should be forced, induced or chivied into adopting another state's economic system, just as no state should be forced, induced or chivied into adopting another state's archi-

tecture or music. The word "force," as used here, is meant to include day-and-night media bombardment.

The Poverty Factor. The fixation of most present-day economists on distribution instead of production will hardly solve the problem of poverty. Taking from the rich and giving to the poor reduces investment and economic growth. When it does raise the living standard of the needy, it only raises it a fraction. It is depressing to say, but the politics of envy when injected into economics is far more alluring to demagogues and their minions than programs calling for tougher work standards and improved production facilities.

Poverty, it goes without saying, is relative. A black African who lives in a mud hut and owns a few animals is dirt poor by Western standards. By African standards, however, he may be fairly well off. More important, he may not feel he is poor. A black in Alabama who owns a late-model car, a half acre and a modest house crammed with work-saving appliances may complain bitterly of his straitened circumstances, while his African brother would consider him a melanized Rockefeller or Rothschild.

The awareness of poverty, which in psychological terms is synonymous with real poverty, is a burning and divisive issue in a multiracial country where class differences are often equivalent to racial differences. If such traits as prudence, foresight and ambition were divided equally among races, the poverty issue would arouse fewer emotions.

The science of genetics should be in the vanguard of the fight against poverty. Some of the mental characteristics that incite people to escape indigence are certainly inborn. Such genes could and should be more widely disseminated by encouraging couples that have exhibited traits for hard work and perseverance to have more children, either by natural methods, artificial insemination or some advanced form of genetic engineering. But this must await the day when the masters of the media stop bad-mouthing eugenics, arguably the most important—and currently the most suspect and most shunned—of all sciences.

Work Habits and Attitudes. Hides, shells, raw metal, coins, bank notes, checks and credit cards—such is the evolution of money. Electronic banking may be the next-to-last step. After that, according to some latter-day Marxists, undismayed by all that has happened to their own dreamland, will come the moneyless economy—houses, food and other necessities will be passed out on the basis of need. There is nothing terribly wrong with this idea, provided the perks are also correlated to merit and job performance. When everyone, the shirker and the overachiever, gets the same handouts, when everyone develops the habit of receiving and not producing, of taking and not giving, soon there may be nothing to receive.

Robots are fine in production lines. They save workers from becoming robots. If labor is reduced to one simple repetitious task or to one computerized operation, in which every step of production from financing and procurement to manufacturing and sales is accomplished by zapping a few keys on a keyboard, then people will have little left to do. Human intelligence is already on the decline, as IQ scores and achievement tests clearly demonstrate. It may well hit bottom if men and women run further and further away from challenges. The brain of Cro-Magnon man was bigger on average than ours because he had to exercise more brainpower to survive. Modern man, at least in the developed nations, need no longer worry about filling his stomach. If he fails to do so by his own efforts, it is filled for him.

The primary job of economics in an ethnostate would not be to increase living standards, but to increase human standards. Citizens of ethnostates will not be encouraged to specialize until they have first become Jacks and Jills of Many Trades. Routine operations in the workplace render both the job and, by extension, the home a dull torture. If work becomes less efficient when undertaken by workers who are somewhat proficient at perhaps a dozen tasks, but are expert at none, then so be it. Work should be attuned to the worker, not the reverse. The loss of manufacturing efficiency would be more than compensated for by the gain in physical and mental well-being of the producers.

The person to have doubts about is the one who tries to make a religion out of an economic system. Times change. Science comes up with new breakthroughs. What suited a small country with a Northern European population a century or so ago may be just the wrong economy for Sri Lanka in the 1990s. Free markets have a great deal going for them, but they can lead to monopolies, price gouging, speculation, inside trading, massive bank failures and high rates of inflation. They frequently give a green light to parasitic speculators who do not improve the economy, but milk and bleed it. A state-run economy in East Germany worked poorly, but far better than the state-run economies of other Soviet bloc nations. We all know—or should know—why. Economics has a strong racial component.

Market economies have their good points, but once they become internationally entwined, defaulted foreign loans, inflated currencies and trade disputes can ignite big and little wars. The ethnostate, which would keep a tight rein on financial adventurism, should avoid such pitfalls, as it adheres to the gospel that wealth should remain in the hands of its creators and in the land of its creation.

Whether the promoters of capitalism agree or not, central planning has been creeping into almost every phase and aspect of their hallowed economic system. Government agencies are as large and numerous in Washington as they are in Beijing. Centralization clearly did not produce enough material goods to satisfy the inhabitants of the Soviet Union. But part of the fault was the economic naïveté of the Russians themselves and the economic hocus-pocus foisted on the war-torn Russian Empire by the largely non-Russian Four Horsemen of Communism (Marx, Trotsky, Lenin, Stalin). What it comes down to is that the Slavic peoples have always lagged behind the West in economic matters, which do not seem to be their forte. When the Slavs bestir themselves in non-economic fields of activity, they can be quite competitive—in H-bombs, ballistic missiles, spy satellites, space exploration, not to mention mathematics, literature, music, the ballet and chess.

Popular in times of prosperity, capitalism and free-market

philosophy lose a lot of their charm and voter support in economic downturns. It is quite possible, as computers become more sophisticated and artificial intelligence software grows "smarter," that central planning and control will play an increasingly important and perhaps positive role in the economy of every state, including future ethnostates.

As man has learned to his sorrow, fighting economic cycles seems as hopeless a task as fighting winter. The wisest step that any economist can make, at this stage of the game, is to plan for spring. All economic systems, whether barter, feudal, capitalist or socialist, have their exasperating periodic curves despite the best efforts of government planners, central banks, financial experts and tip-sheet gurus. Economic swings offer great opportunities for politicking. Lean times are good times for demagogues and class warriors, even though the busts, as well as the booms, have little or nothing to do with dark conspiracies of blood-sucking international bankers and cartels. Consumed by resentment at the high-flying life of the jet set, the malcontent never realizes that the "sweetest" revenge is to make the object of his envy envious of him. But since this would involve a great expenditure of personal effort, it is much easier to sit back and keep accusing rich folks of every crime in the book.

People work not only for money and subsistence. They work because of a work ethic, because of an innate impulse to work. To provide for family and offspring is an inherited survival mechanism. A high unemployment rate, aside from the poverty which comes in its wake, has a depressing effect on morale. Work, at least for Westerners, is a means of getting man out of himself. A man without work develops attitudes and feelings that can be extremely anti-social. His dire financial straits are one cause. But what really grinds him down is his inability to obey one of his deepest instincts—the instinct to work for work's sake.

Capitalism, Pro and Con. Some races or subraces have developed a fondness for laissez-faire; others trend towards collectivism. Some are attracted to what is loosely termed

socialism; others towards capitalism, which comes in many shapes and models.

Capitalism has a record of propelling many, too many, of the more capable and intelligent Westerners into a mad scramble for riches. These superior types might better have directed their superior capabilities towards other goals.

Though some of the fault is due to heavy-handed intrusions of government, latter-day capitalism has had a significant influence on the breakup of families. More and more mothers have to abandon their children to day-care centers in order to make enough money to keep the family in one piece. Ironically, the family is broken up in the day to keep it together at night.

In an ethnostate one of the primary aims of the economy would be to unify families and keep them unified by making it possible for mothers to remain with their offspring as long as necessary. In pre-school years the mother's continued presence is of vital importance to proper child-rearing. It is equally important that married couples incapable of bearing children have the opportunity, if they so desire, of adopting someone of their own race. In a multiracial state minority children crowd the adoption market, which usually means that infertile couples, if they wish to have a family, often end up with a child whose race differs from their own.

One advantage of the so-called free-enterprise system is that it encourages people to be self-reliant, to be inventive, to go about their business with only a minimal bureaucracy looking over their shoulders. Most people will work more productively and more creatively when they have some input about the goals and conditions of their labor and do not have tyrannical bureaucrats or floor bosses riding herd on them the moment they punch the time clock.

Those who lived through the Great Depression, which occurred at the high point of the free-market euphoria in the capitalist West, did not find it an amusing experience. Six decades later, no longer able to produce as much as they consume, Americans are again beginning to have doubts about their economy. When the bills for all the mountainous borrowing,

horrendous trade imbalances and bankrupting budget deficits come due, capitalism will lose a great deal of its sheen, though its most fervent supporters will blame the government, not their cherished economic system.

Yesterday, when most Westerners were doing fairly well, it was two and a half cheers for capitalism and laissez-faire. This sunny cheerfulness will quickly cloud over when 50 or 100 million Westerners are out of work, when soup lines are a mile long and when a loaf of stale bread costs a week's wages.

A Word About Foreign Trade. Free trade does not promote peace. Countries have gone to war only a few years after signing popular, all-embracing trade agreements. Since collecting duties is one of the easiest and most lucrative ways for governments to fill their treasuries, tariffs are more politically acceptable than import quotas or "voluntary restraints."

Free trade became a popular icon after British entrepreneurs invented mass production and fired up the industrial revolution. Since the British soon dominated world trade, they decided they had nothing to lose by getting rid of their tariffs. Meanwhile, a vast credit system, which would have hardly been possible in an earlier time or in any other country, provided the necessary financing for a quantum leap into a credit economy.

The United States would have industrialized much more slowly if it had not been for the protectionist wall it raised against the output of British factories. The War of 1812, when practically all British goods were cut off, was a godsend to American producers. To the consternation of the free-trade advocates, the era of high tariffs was an era of great U.S. industrial progress and expansion (1880-1929).

After World World II only the United States, Australia, Canada, Sweden and Switzerland had what could be called an intact industrial infrastructure. In 1947 the United States could boast of half the world's gross national product, most of the steel production and 80% of the automobile production. Forty years later Japan and West Germany were exporting more than America on a per capita basis, proving that in some ways it

actually profits nations to undergo wartime destruction. They are then forced to build new, up-to-date manufacturing facilities, which quickly outproduce the older, outdated plants of the victorious nations.

Export subsidies, "beggaring thy neighbor and beggaring thyself," artificially boost world trade. Fair trade, often amounts to no more than telling other countries what they must do in the international market. Many trade problems would disappear in a world of ethnostates, since economic self-sufficiency shrivels foreign commerce. The less trade, the fewer the trade disagreements.

Lower costs should not be the grand design of an economic system. Different countries have different wage scales. To lose an entire industry, as happened when Japanese-made TV sets became the overwhelming choice of Americans, may have resulted in lower-cost and higher-quality products, but it was not a free ride. The market turnaround drove more American workers into lower-paying service jobs, thereby lowering living standards and assuring a less skilled work force in the future.

There is nothing fundamentally wrong with paying more for a product if the higher price is beneficial to society at large. Despite the bleak warnings of the free traders, if a trade war keeps a substantial number of people, one's own people, from losing jobs, then the war should be fought. Trade wars enable people to develop their own talents and resources—at a price, of course, and generally at a higher price. But the alternative may be the dispersal of the country's production facilities and production skills to countries with lower wage scales. Should a Western worker be forced out of a good job at a microchip manufacturing plant and be compelled to find employment in a fast-food eatery because Korean computer firms pay their employees one-fifth of what his American counterpart takes home? He most definitely should not.

Assume that a $75 foreign watch is slightly better than a $100 one made in the United States. If people are willing to put their fellow citizens out of work to save $25 on a watch, their country, sooner or later, will lose much of its export trade to foreign nations that offer lower prices, not just for watches,

but for hundreds of other products. Eventually, this drain would seriously threaten any country's economic health.

Free trade in its worse aspects multiplies inequalities and deprives citizens of country A of the opportunity of being employed in industries manufacturing a product that has become a monopoly of country B, which has a much lower wage scale and which may even have copied or stolen the product from Country A. People thrown out of work in country A are not casualties of trade war; they are casualties of trade peace.

A North American continent in which ethnostates have supplanted a multiracial superpower might prove to be an economic boon to all concerned. Not only would there be less labor turmoil because of the homogeneous workforces, but the GNPs of the different ethnostates might add up to more than the combined GNPs of the U.S., Canada, Mexico and the Central American countries before their metamorphosis into ethnostates. Just as a monoracial army would fight more bravely and stubbornly than a multiracial one, all else being equal, so a monoracial work force, revved up by an *esprit de corps,* could be depended on to work harder and better than a multiracial one.

International trade, say the economic textbooks, is the process by which goods are provided by one country to another country, which is deficient in such goods. In return, the providing country is supplied with goods that it is lacking or, if not goods, then the money representing the value of such goods. Ideally, the value of what is exported annually should surpass or equal the value of what is imported annually.

But this is not the way international trade works. Many nations purchase much more than they sell. Some of them eventually welsh on huge debts accumulated by years of irresponsible buying on credit. Sooner or later, the exporting countries will be compelled to swallow all or part of their losses. Sooner or later, some big banks will go belly up, and some currencies will be inflated into worthlessness. Then the economic confidence game starts all over again. If the trade is interrupted for too long a period, factory workers in the in-

dustrial nations will be out of a job, and field hands in the countries that supply the raw materials will be idled. To avoid or alleviate these consequences the international banking system endeavors to keep trade going by massive loans, many of which will never be repaid, either in part or in full.

The above demerits notwithstanding, foreign trade continues to be a desideratum by almost all the world's governments. It is true that certain "one crop" nations have attempted to reduce their almost total dependence on foreign buyers by trying to build an industrial base—more often than not to no avail. They find it much easier to keep concentrating on their one source of foreign revenue (sugar, for example, in Cuba) and hope for the best. The Cubans prayed that the world price of sugar wouldn't fall. If it should (as it did), they trusted an ideological ally to continue to pay a greatly inflated price as an under-the-table subsidy for allowing their country to serve as a Soviet military base. When the U.S.S.R. fell apart and the subsidy was cut back, Fidel Castro had to order his peons to develop an autarkic economy pronto. Whether the Castro regime will survive this crisis remains an open question at this writing. Whatever the outcome, the shift in the direction of economic independence will eventually be helpful to Cuba, provided the islanders seriously wish to stop being economic puppets of foreigners.

The right economy for any state is one based on its own resources and skills, which is to say that the surest guarantee of the state's survival is its ability to produce enough food to feed its citizens, enough clothing to clothe them and enough housing to house them. At the same time it must have an industrial plant large enough to produce a minimal amount of simple manufactured products. If these requirements cannot be met, then the country's existence is always at risk and its independence more theoretical than real.

Cynics may say it is both silly and presumptuous to demand that every ethnostate be largely self-sufficient. They may be right in regard to high technology. But not all ethnostates need to design and fabricate the fanciest semi-conductor. Some will want high tech more for show than necessity. Others will try to

compete with the industrialized nations and succeed only to the point of accumulating a ziggurat of IOUs.

The world of tomorrow will have agricultural societies, techno-agricultural societies and high-technology societies. Each ethnostate should try to fit its particular requirements to the capabilities and needs of its members, capitalizing on their own special aptitudes and avoiding attempts to become political and cultural carbon copies of people with different aptitudes and needs. Economic mimicry should not be viewed as a form of flattery, but as an open sesame to decline and stagnation.

A favorable trade balance means that raw materials or manufactured goods have been shipped out of a country at a greater rate than comparable amounts of raw materials and goods have been imported. A net loss of resources is inadequate compensation for a net gain in currency. Economists will say that paper money can easily be transformed into goods, automobiles or supersonic bombers. It can, when the country printing the banknotes is presumed to be solvent. In times of high inflation and economic distress, when paper money loses most or all of its value, people are forced to sell their valuables for currency, whose buying power is declining at the rate of 50% a day.

Protectionism, we have been warned, brings retaliation. However, even an outright trade war has its advantages. Countries will be less denuded of their natural resources. Some workers will lose jobs, other will get new jobs, as the domestic market is forced to expand. Employment will decline in the export business, but it will only be a onetime dislocation. Henceforth, the economy will be focused on the domestic market, which will enjoy a new degree of stability as it frees itself from the wild currency gyrations and price fluctuations in the world market.

The most dubious kind of trade is that which involves such irreplaceable and unrenewable resources as energy fuels and minerals. The greater the amount of food produced, the greater the use of pesticides and the greater the exhaustion of the soil. The sale of agricultural products to foreign states is a financial gravy train for agribusiness, but not necessarily for the small farmer who can't compete with food-growing con-

glomerates. When the soil becomes depleted and overworked, prices will soar in the supermarkets. The profits of American petroleum companies hit the ceiling when the United States was an exporter of cheap oil. But if oil exports had been limited or forbidden, America would have many times the amount of oil it now has, would not be paying three or four times as much for it and would not be importing half its oil from overseas.

Trade policy should not be based on short-term profits, but on its long-term effects on the living standards and security of the country in question. The depletion of a state's natural resources must be guarded against, especially in times of economic crisis when politicians want to boost the economy by dumping precious reserves of strategic materials on the world market. To put it bluntly, there is no such thing as short-term, quick-fix economics.

Trade should not be subsidized, as so much foreign commerce is today, by export loans, grants and other forms of financial aid. This is not trade; it is a form of economic legerdemain developed for the mass transfer of goods, food products and other assets from rich nations to poor nations. Many such shipments often fail to reach their destination and find their way into the homes, warehouses and bank accounts of corrupt ruling elites. The mere presence of these goods increases the demand for more of the same, thereby multiplying the importing countries' dependence on foreign benefactors. Perhaps the 19th-century Austrian economist, Adam Müller, who advised banning the gold standard because it promoted international commerce, was not as mad as modern economists make him out to be.

One of the great negatives of international trade, however, is not economic, but aesthetic. What is more depressing than to turn a corner in some colorful Asian city and see on a wall beside the entrance to a mosque or temple a huge Coca-Cola sign? Or to see a garish McDonald's ad in the window of a pub in a quiet English village? The Americanization of much of the world, though thankfully in decline, has not been the result of American cultural superiority, but of American eco-

nomic clout. Like water spilling over a dam, the culture of a powerful economy spills over into weak economies. This invidious attack on cultural autonomy can only be arrested by sharp reductions in foreign trade. Transnational corporations, banks and any organizations or persons involved in international commerce are dyed-in-the-wool opponents of cultural diversity. Whether they know it or not, these "free traders" are working to establish a one-world economy and along with it a one-world culture.

Though it may be hard to sell the idea to those who have been spoiled by a surfeit of material goods and work-saving devices, the lack of a few creature comforts would actually raise the spiritual and intellectual level of a state when and if its citizens are forced to diversify their economy and rely more on their own talents and resources and less on foreign products.

"Foreign trade is dangerous to your cultural health" is a solemn warning that should be drilled into the mind of every economist, who should devote his brainpower to cutting down and eventually abolishing much of this trade rather than devising ways and means of increasing it. If people want a taste of "foreignness," let them travel abroad. Allowing foreign firms to corner a giant share of the market in one's own homeland pushes the world a little closer to the aesthetic horror of global sameness.

Toying with Taxes. With an efficient nationwide system of electronic banking once in place and with practically all transactions handled by checks and credit cards, there should be no reason why tax dodging and tax fraud could not be largely eliminated. When all income and expenses are entered in computer data banks, most tax forms could be eliminated. Collection costs would be reduced to a minimum, a saving which could be translated into lower taxes for all. The ultimate form of tax collection should be automatic withholding of all taxes on all financial transactions. At that stage a great part of the huge tax-collecting bureaucracy would have no choice but to call it quits.

Taxes are ideal weapons for shaping and managing economies. Differential tax rates can favor producers over non-producers, the working rich over the nonworking rich, the artist over the agent, the teacher over the entertainer. Differential tax rates, used to determine the nature and form of a society, can be designed to bring out the best characteristics and capabilities of the members of that society.

Ethnostates would end the tax-exempt status of the "churches" of embezzling televangelists. It would, however, be the general responsibility of government to see that authentic religions have some form of economic protection. In view of the racial and cultural unity of ethnostates, it is probable that only a few religious denominations will exist in any particular ethnostate at any particular time.

In regard to foundations, many of the largest were created for both noble and ignoble purposes: to bring education to the masses, to sprinkle largesse among the indigent and, last but not least, to dodge inheritance taxes. Today, the billion-dollar foundations have largely fallen into the hands of bureaucrats, many of them minority members. In the matter of the poor, the disabled and the mentally ill, their needs can be addressed more effectively by state agencies than by the sporadic and often uncoordinated efforts of private charitable organizations, many of which are more interested in helping along the idiosyncratic ideologies of their directors than in helping the helpless.

Financial Flummery. One great bane of modern economics is monetarism, the brainchild of Milton Friedman. Monetarism permits bankers to hold a whip hand over a nation's economy. Friedman is advocating controlling economic growth or decline by keeping a tight grip on the money supply. If prices rise too fast, decrease the supply. If production falls off, print more dollars. Money consequently becomes a sort of economic Bed of Procrustes, as it abandons its principal purpose—to serve as a medium of exchange. Whereas inflation should be controlled by increased production and price competition, monetarism simply cuts down the amount of money

available, which in turn slows and reduces production. The problem is solved by creating a more serious problem.

This backhanded way of running an economy would be quickly ended in ethnostates, the economic goal of which would not be growth or trade, but to enable people to earn the wherewithal to maintain a decent standard of living. Monetarism would go the way of Keynesianism and all the other economic isms which have been tried, tested and ultimately found wanting.

Future generations of citizens would be given equal consideration with the present generation in all the financial matters of an ethnostate. This means that the "borrow now, default later" policy of many present-day governments would be illegal. No longer would debt be piled upon debt and interest payment piled upon interest payment, all to be heaped on the children and the grandchildren of irresponsible fathers and grandfathers, who burdened their offspring and descendants with an indebtedness that could only be settled by massive default (bankruptcy) or massive inflation (fraudulent payoffs with cheaper and nearly worthless currency).

Here it might be enlightening to briefly call up some numbers that foreshadow what the future has in store for the United States. At the end of fiscal 1990 the government was in debt to the tune of nearly $3.3 trillion. When completed, the S&L bailout will cost no one knows how many billions. On the tax front, privately owned companies pay about 50 cents on the dollar of pretax earnings just to meet interest payments, compared to 30 cents in 1980 and 10 cents in the 1960s (Fortune, Aug. 27, 1990).

Despite these financial alarums, Congress cannot agree on legislation to effectively curb, let alone stop, this lemming-like rush to total insolvency. Accordingly, it is a fairly safe bet that, if and when ethnostates are carved out of the United States, they will be founded on America's economic ruins.

Brake on Immigration. Dazzled by the riches of the industrialized nations, most denizens of Third World countries want what they cannot produce and cannot afford. Loans and grants

help assuage their longings, but these cannot go on forever. The oil will eventually run out in those sheikdoms which are enjoying a temporary boom selling their irreplaceable natural resource. When the wells run dry, those few fortunate backward nations who are currently and serendipitously "in the chips" will rejoin their less geographically endowed Third World cousins.

The worst aspect of these economic imbalances is that it tempts Third World peoples to migrate to the source and fountainhead of all the riches, the countries which, with the exception of Japan, have overly altruistic, if not slightly insane, immigration and refugee policies. The inflow of West Indians, Asian Indians and Pakistanis into Britain, of North Africans and blacks into France and Italy, and of Turks and Eastern Europeans into Germany introduces new racial and cultural frictions into countries still simmering with ancient ethnic and religious rivalries and hostilities. These flowing rivers of immigration are fearsome menaces to domestic peace and tranquillity. Black riots in England and North African and black riots in France are just a small indication of what can be expected later. In the United States, massive legal and illegal immigration of Russian Jews, Hispanics and Asians continues to fuel the racial powder keg that is making life in many of the biggest cities a daily misery. White flight offers some relief from this intolerable state of affairs, but the migration is so disorganized, haphazard and random that it would take an army of demographic experts to sort out the various population groups for inclusion in future ethnostates.

Westerners can hardly be blamed for enjoying the plenty they created. But they should remember that this same plenty, which acts as a magnet for non-Westerners, may well be the cause of the West's downfall. Plenty may well turn into scarcity, when non-Westerners take over much of the West by sheer force of numbers. To make things worse, there is absolutely no assurance that the people who could not make a go of it in their own homelands will do any better in—or for—their new habitats.

Ethnostates offer at least one solution to the race-mixing

problem by accenting the philosophy and politics of separatism and opposing immigration. By encouraging all population groups to concentrate on their good points and make the best of their particular talents, ethnostates would instill a pride of accomplishment and a measure of self-esteem in their citizens that would tend to keep them at home and put an end to their rushing off to Western countries, which may give them work, but will never give them the feeling of belonging.

Recapitulation. One of the most salient economic issues facing Westerners is the proper degree of government control. Left-wing and socialist politicians, while putting distribution and marketing above production in their economic priorities, continue to emphasize the immorality of unemployment and "capitalist exploitation" in their speeches and writings. Since these issues can hardly be solved by government indifference, the mere fact of raising them must be regarded as proposals for increased federal control. On the other hand, when modern conservatives, today's but not yesterday's apostles of decentralization, are elected to office, their economic promises quickly founder on the rocks of practical politics. The upshot is that most attempts to reduce government economic controls in Western countries during the latter half of the 20th century have been largely confined to rhetoric and speechifying. It is probably true that most Westerners want some decentralization of their top-heavy governments. At the same time, however, they do not want any substantial reduction in government services.

Associated with rhetorical attacks against big government is criticism of central economic planning. A principal argument of the decentralizers is the economic failures of socialist countries. Television constantly reminds us of the long lines in front of Russian food stores and the lack of all but life's bare essentials in Communist societies or in societies recovering from communism. The quasi-socialist states of Scandinavia are carefully omitted from these visual polemics. How so? Quite simply because they have the world's highest living standards. When the attack shifts to Scandinavian economies, we hear

much about the lack of incentive, the high suicide rate, the confiscatory taxes, but very little about food or housing shortages or free womb-to-tomb health care.

What economic successes the deregulation-minded conservatives have achieved while in or out of political office have been balanced by the troubling problems of eternal overborrowing. Deficit spending tends to increase rather than decrease under conservative leadership, mainly because of tax reduction and the pusillanimous unwillingness of enough politicians of whatever ideological hue to cut spending and to put the economy on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Though economists are reluctant to admit it, the failure of planned economies in the Soviet Union and its erstwhile satellites in eastern Europe and the Third World could be attributed as well to racial and cultural factors as to central planning. Since this line of argument is generally taboo, conservatives have been able to get away with blaming all the economic woes of the Communist nations on their economic systems. Since these arguments are never properly answered, the conservative explanation has become an economic axiom, even for many Western liberals.

As long as their stomachs are full, people seldom vote for or support any serious economic change. But when there is widespread hunger and unemployment, proposals for radical solutions quickly climb to the top of the political agenda. Abandoning old approaches to problems, however, especially old approaches to economic problems, does not guarantee progress. Fate seems to have decreed that no one economic system can run smoothly for long. Boundaries change, wars erupt, populations shift in numbers and in character. New resources are discovered; old resources are exhausted. Not even the most farseeing, ingenious economic policies can cope with massive alterations in economic landscapes.

Smallness is more of an advantage than disadvantage in nations undertaking economic reform. In huge multiracial states the disharmonic interactions of regional economies make managing and planning the overall economy extremely difficult. Regions fight for their own local economic interests,

while the state tries—and under such conditions generally fails—to look out for the interests of all. A regional economy is obviously easier to manage than a vast state apparatus sitting on top of several competing regional economies. One region may want high tariffs, another may want free trade. One may be agricultural, another industrial. There is not much that government can do to draw these incompatible economic factions together.

For most of human history people, no matter what form of government they lived under, were on their own. Their lives and livelihoods did not depend on incoming shipments of food, manufactured products or raw materials. The present state of affairs in which the survival of large numbers of people and even nations hinges on lines of communication thousands of miles long is quite dangerous, as has been amply demonstrated by wartime blockades and peacetime embargoes.

As stated previously, international or interregional trade would diminish in a world of ethnostates. Certain minerals and natural resources, certain foods and grains that are "region bound" will obviously be factors in foreign commerce for some time to come. But since agricultural science and the technology of synthetic materials are not standing still, even the smallest and poorest ethnostate might soon be able to produce a great deal of its basic needs within its own borders.

As people eventually work out their own culture, so, if given the chance, they will work out their own economy. Notwithstanding the theories of modern economists, human behavior exerts more influence on economics than vice versa.

New Approaches. The future offers us unlimited time to devise better and more advanced economic systems than those denominated by capitalism and socialism. None of these systems has eliminated poverty; none has provided all its citizens with adequate housing and nutrition; none has eliminated the economic causes of war. All have revoked in one way or another what should be the fundamental right of all responsible and intelligent adult human beings—reasonable access to capital.

The overbureaucratization of the economic sector would pose much less of a problem in ethnostates than in other forms of government. Fewer factions and pressure groups will be available to put conflicting demands on the economy. The cooperation necessary to fulfill economic goals will be greater for the obvious reason that a homogeneous population pulls together better than a heterogeneous one.

Since both capitalism (booms, busts, inflation) and socialism (petrified centralization) have exhibited many depressing examples of failure, both could stand some overhauling. Despite the rote protestations of free-market buffs, there is no reason why an intelligently run economy cannot offer more equitable work incentives than old-fashioned, tooth-and-claw capitalism does. At the very minimum, it can stop once and for all the gross unfairness of an ignorant, illiterate young singer with a third-rate voice earning more money in a week than a grade-school teacher earns in a lifetime. It would also end a financial system that permits, even assists, a junk bond impresario to make hundreds of millions of dollars in one year by saddling once profitable companies with mountainous debt. It would also make it possible for speculators in coal mine stocks to make more in a few days by buying or promising to buy a few pieces of paper than a miner can make in thirty or forty years of dangerous, backbreaking drudgery in dust-filled, molelike foul-smelling tunnels hundreds of feet below the earth. No amount of praise for Adam Smith and Milton Friedman, no amount of effusive references to the glories of free enterprise, can justify or excuse such disparities.

Although free marketeers will stoutly deny it, irresponsible financial speculation can be prohibited without ending legitimate risk-taking and investment opportunities. Similarly, the economic dogmatists of the far left must outgrow and abandon their belief that private property is theft and that private ownership of the means of production is synonymous with exploitation.

Putting aside nuclear war, an attack from outer space and worldwide famine and plague, the greatest threat to economic evolution is probably the decline of intelligence. If this evo-

lutionary dead-end can be avoided, there might be no limit to economic progress.

Masses of accurate economic data can eliminate much of the waste that has bedeviled human endeavor through the ages. The enormous power of high technology, if given the task of solving economic problems, could usher in a semi-permanent age of plenty. In fact, so much economic progress might ensue that an entirely new danger could present itself. How would human beings, whose lives throughout most of history have always been threatened by war, disease, hunger and violence, cope with a radically new type of existence in which most of mankind's traditional problems have been overcome? The psychological impact would be unsettling, even perhaps unhinging. The most disturbing factor would probably be the combination of too much leisure with too much security. One way of avoiding the dangers of this utopian lifestyle might be to transform all that leisure into productive hobbies, so that everyone's spare time would be concentrated on purposeful projects. But no matter what problems crop up, by eliminating some of the principal deterrents to human achievement the chances are that man's built-in adaptiveness and flexibility would eventually come to his rescue and allow him to reaffirm his lordship over the broadest range of environments.

Chapter 9

Educational Benefits

Mind Broadening. One means of getting at the biology of culture is to examine the effects of tolerating parasitic growth. Institutions soften when their creators soften. A splurge of laws to protect minorities from discrimination is a sign not only of changing times but of changing demographics.

Being human, we all have roughly the same cerebral apparatus. Being of different racial strains, we use and apply our brains in different ways. No matter how our genomes read, almost all of us are capable of acting and thinking logically and illogically.

Certain population groups, following their inherited tastes, play up the arts to the detriment of the sciences. Others take a different path. How many young people have been induced by their peer groups and perhaps even by their churches to believe there is something "sissified" about art? Conversely, the student who flunked his first science course may lose all interest in mathematics, physics and chemistry for as long as he remains in school or college. Because of trifling classroom setbacks, such as an inadvertent C or D, millions of adults will never read a serious book once they finish their education. Other millions, after a sad experience in vocational training, will never "dirty their hands" trying to repair a leaky faucet or change a tire. Not many of us have both the "show me" attitude of the fictive Missourian and the ability to compose or appreciate serious music. Favoring the arts to the extent of shutting out the sciences or having the reverse preference is

living half a life. Although their brains have two hemispheres, all too many people choose to utilize only one—either the right hemisphere, the "factory" of the imagination, or the left, the empire of empiricism.

In such cases personalized education can come to the rescue and exert strong, constructive influences on human development. All our mental capabilities in both cranial hemispheres can be brought into play with some extra attention, instruction and coaching, making possible a vastly richer intellectual life.

Every student of every race would benefit from programs designed to awaken all the powerful resources that lie dormant in the human brain, resources that may never come to light in the confusion and chaos of a heterogeneous educational system.

The art/science dichotomy is not a hard and fast determinant of the bias or tilt of the human personality. No one need be a cranial prisoner of the right or left hemisphere. There is nothing schizoid or "weird" about using both parts of the brain alternatively or simultaneously. For examples of the extremely proficient use of both, one thinks of Pascal and Goethe.

The teachers and professors in an ethnostate, infused with the same culture as their students, will have much less trouble passing this culture on. In multiracial educational institutions a great deal of instruction time is wasted watering down the curriculum and endlessly repeating the lessons to make them "understandable" to everyone. Teachers must be constantly on guard against minority students taking offense at whatever might be taught or said in class. When one pupil's hero is another pupil's devil, as so often happens in multiracial classrooms (e.g., Columbus), all heroes tend to be dethroned, except perhaps some historic figures who are less than heroic but who are praised in order to heighten the self-esteem of minority students.

With the possibilities for racial infighting removed, teachers in an ethnostate will no longer have to spend much of their time on the disciplinary problems that plague racially mixed schools. Equally important, they will no longer have to conduct courses on esoteric cultures about which they know little

and which they appreciate less. Before students are taught about other peoples and cultures, they should first learn about their own. The classrooms in every ethnostate will be filled with the children of that ethnostate and no other children. The students would learn with each other and from each other. Only at the higher stages of education would the students of one ethnostate learn about the people and culture of other ethnostates.

When the oracle at Delphi told the pilgrim, "Know thyself," the advice was right on track. Two and a half millennia later, it still remains the all-important first step in education, a step which is being bypassed in the multiracialism and multiculturalism which now holds sway in American schools, where the practice is to teach most white pupils a great deal about other cultures but not a great deal about their own.

Educational Aims. Race is felt, seldom taught. If taught, it is seldom understood. If understood, its power for good or evil is awesome. Once they have come to terms with their own racial feelings, men and women will come to know the importance of understanding and respecting the feelings of other races. To understand ourselves we have to understand both the inner and the outer self—the genetic self and the environmentally conditioned self.

Today, what knowledge we have of these matters is largely focused on the environmentally conditioned self, mainly on that part of the individual which is probed unscientifically, loosely and often irresponsibly by psychiatrists, psychologists and psychoanalysts. This probing leads, more often than not, to the misunderstanding of self. Meanwhile, the genetic probing is generally limited to detecting hereditary illnesses or defects, either before or after birth.

The ethnostate, since it puts so much emphasis on the relationship between the individual and the group, will stimulate the study of the genetic self, genes being the chief determinants of both individual and collective behavior.

When foreign peoples and cultures are studied, the instructor's aim should be to identify their differences along with

their similarities. A non-Chinese does not study Chinese art to become a Chinese artist or adopt a Chinese art style, but to learn about Chinese art. Knowledge of foreign cultures helps us know more about ourselves. But all intercultural studies should be approached as a biologist approaches a microscope. By studying simian chromosomes he does not seek to become more like a monkey.

It is in this spirit of Olympian detachment that all education which does not apply directly to the student's own culture should be undertaken. It is possible to appreciate French literature without becoming a Frenchman. In fact, acquiring a knowledge of French literature under the guidance of an intelligent teacher increases one's appreciation of one's own literature—not the other way around. It should be emphasized and reemphasized that the main purpose of all cross-cultural studies should be to obtain a greater appreciation of one's own culture.

Since the population of ethnostates will be homogeneous, racial integration at the school level, one of the great sore spots of modern learning, will no longer be an issue. Whatever segregation that still persists in education would be based on educational preferences, aptitudes and capabilities.

One obvious goal of education is to prepare students to become cooperative and constructive members of society. Education begins in the family, continues in the school and, as the case may be, goes on to college and beyond. Formal education ends when the individual begins the career for which his years of schooling have prepared him or, more commonly in these confused times, unprepared him. Informal education should only end with death. A full life calls for constant mental expansion.

Since ethnostates would differ, education in ethnostates would be tailored to these differences. Just as each ethnic group's educational requirements vary, so does each group's educational capabilities. Educators should be committed to raising every student to the limit of his learning potential, taking into account the wide variances in such potential in both individuals and groups. No one should be undereducated, but

overeducation for those with limited capacity to absorb certain curricula can lead to serious psychological damage. A college student who barely graduates and then finds his first job too difficult to handle may be headed for a lifetime of frustration. He has been prepared for a level of work that he can never properly perform. Along with his unmerited degree comes a lifetime of unrealized hopes.

Students in an ethnostate would be taught more about their virtues and less about their vices. In multiracial schools when whites are discussed, the emphasis is generally on their sins, not their good points.

Education should always contain an optimistic note and be treated as the introduction to a great adventure. Dry-as-dust teachers and professors ought to be swept out with all the other educational cobwebs. Since humans of every shape and size have adapted to very diverse circumstances and conditions in the past, they should be able to take the most radical changes in education in their stride. Our forebears, especially our Northern European forebears, have been guilty of many sins, but not the sin of mental sloth.

Gifts for the Gifted. Breaches of discipline, vandalism, crime and classroom violence being considerably less of a problem in a monoracial educational system, educators in an ethnostate could finally get back to the business of teaching. The results should be phenomenal. Public schools would have the opportunity to harvest large crops of aristocrats of merit since they will no longer be deprived of the children, especially the gifted children, who were sent to private schools to escape the chaos of school desegregation. Public schools also would be able to seek out talented white students with the eagerness that nonwhite students, talented and untalented, are now sought out by multiracial schools.

Recognizing and even celebrating human differences, each ethnostate would encourage students to capitalize on both their collective and individual distinctiveness. Educators would pick up on this theme and let race out of its academic prison. Anthropology is a science. Biology is a science. Genetics is a

science. Species, phyla and other categories of living things have an honored place in education. Man would have the most honored place of all.

Consider the gifted schoolchild whose academic performance is well above average. The present-day Western attitude towards him, at least when it is publicly expressed, is largely indifferent, on occasion even hostile. Highly intelligent students actually become targets of the media and are often put in the same unpleasant social slot as smart-aleck playboys. Instead of organizing courses so their more intelligent pupils can move forward at a faster pace, present-day educators are often content to let them sit and vegetate in the same classroom with average and below-average students.

The results are hopelessly counterproductive. The gifted student, compelled to study and restudy what he already knows, may permanently lose all interest in learning. The low-IQ student, forced to compete for grades against more active minds, will always come out second best. The ensuing frustration is one of the chief causes of the alarming dropout rate in high schools and colleges.

Just as the mentally handicapped need special education, so do the mentally advantaged. The talents of gifted pupils can be shown to best advantage by putting them in classes where they have to compete with their intellectual equals. In accelerated courses their brains are kept at a boil and remain unaffected by the dull torpidity that permeates so many contemporary classrooms.

The extra attention expended on the slow learner is often impractical. His innate disabilities simply cannot be overcome by any remedy short of genetic engineering. For students with superior intelligence, the sky is the limit. The extra work and attention dedicated to their education is worth every extra dollar and every extra hour. The more that is done for them in school, the more they will be able to do for their people when they finish their education.

Gifted blacks, relatively few in number, do little to improve matters since they are immediately siphoned off to the most prestigious private schools and universities, thereby denying

these superior educational opportunities to equally qualified whites. The average black, his ranks thinned by the removal of the intelligent members of his race, does more poorly in class than ever, while the gifted white, his chances for a better education reduced by racial quotas and lower classroom standards, may compensate for the unfair treatment by retreating into an obsessive, anti-black racism that will hound and distort his thinking for the rest of his life.

Different population groups absorb lessons at different speeds. Their "learning clock" ticks at different tempos. Education has failed so miserably in multiracial states because pupils of all population groups—white, brown and yellow—are subjected to one statewide, in many cases one nationwide, curriculum. No such educational mismatching will occur in an ethnostate. Homogeneity automatically solves one of the great drawbacks of modern education—forcing children of varying racial and cultural backgrounds into the same educational mold.

Testing. An individual's school performance and work résumé are fairly reliable records of his abilities. But even after being out in the world and working at one or more jobs, many persons need five to ten years more to find their niche in life. A well-conceived battery of IQ tests, motor reaction measurements (reaction time to various stimuli such as flashing lights and moving objects) and personality assessments can sometimes find the right career for men and women in a matter of hours. The results from such tests direct testees to the occupation or occupations where their talents can be put to the most effective use, both for themselves and for the citizenry at large.

The basic argument against such tests, especially tests designed to measure intelligence, is that they assign individuals, often irreversibly, to permanent categories of capabilities and aptitudes. If they are accurate, that is exactly what these tests should do. Critics of testing, on the other hand, assert that members of certain ethnic groups have been conditioned by their history (slavery, for example) to do worse than the rest of

the population. If this hypothesis is correct, it is one more compelling reason why separate educational systems should be taken seriously. Separate schools for different population groups would go a long way in eliminating environmental and genetic objections to tests, because those tested would be of similar racial and cultural backgrounds and would be taking tests devised by their own people.

The opponents of intelligence tests admit, albeit reluctantly, that IQ scores vary with race. The average for whites is 100, for blacks 85, for Asians a few points above 100. Within the white population, average IQ scores also vary. Largely for understandable reasons, not much publicity has been given to such research. One or two tests have shown that Northern and Northwestern Europeans and their descendants overseas have the highest IQ scores of any race or population group.

Opponents of intelligence tests don't and won't admit that the causes of the variations are largely innate. Admittedly, IQ critics have a point. A high-IQ score is not an ironclad guarantee of a successful career. A finely tuned motor is a nice piece of machinery to have under the hood. But to get the most out of the car, a trustworthy driver is needed. A clean high-octane gas (morality, perseverance and health) also helps.

To obtain a fairly complete profile of anyone, much more than intelligence and achievement tests are required: tests for genetic and psychological defects, tests for attitude, concentration, feeling, taste, control, moral balance and tests for the many other physical and mental traits that constitute the marvel of biological complexity known as man. Many such tests—several correlating fairly well with IQ scores—have already been devised, among them the motor reaction measurements mentioned previously and, most notably, the multiple personality tests developed by Raymond Cattell.

Test scores should be guarded like state secrets. Advertising low scores injures the ego of low scorers and gives high scorers exaggerated opinions of themselves that can only be confirmed by successful careers. In any case, test scores are not foolproof predictors of future success in school or in the job market.

Falling Standards. While on the subject of education it should be kept in mind that at the high watermarks of Western culture, only a small percentage of the population (8% in German lands in Goethe's time) was literate. But education is not a matter of percentages. In some ways, a literate Westerner of the late 20th century is less educated and less cultured than an illiterate 17th-century European peasant. Now that several Western countries, but not the United States, boast of the 100% literacy of their adult citizens, it is nevertheless doubtful that more than 50% are able to understand, let alone enjoy, the literary classics that enchanted their forefathers. A much smaller percentage appreciates the output of modern writers, painters, sculptors and composers, who seem to go out of their way to divorce themselves and their work from ordinary people. Two or three centuries ago analphabetic English laborers could understand passages from Shakespeare when they were read out loud or when they heard them at the Globe Theatre. Nowadays, many educated Westerners have difficulty reading Shakespeare and would much rather tune in a lowly television sitcom than a beautifully stylized BBC-TV production of King Lear.

The lamentable state of the study of American history has been glaringly illustrated by a National Endowment for the Humanities poll (October 1989), which found that 24% of the college seniors responding thought Columbus discovered the New World after 1500, 34% believed the Pilgrims signed the Magna Carta and 40% were convinced that the Emancipation Proclamation was the work of the Constitutional Convention (1787). Such is the educational level of *college seniors*, not inner-city dropouts.

With more young black males in prison than in college, those most in need of education are wasting precious years in crowded cells, as their young brothers bring their street culture to school and turn classrooms into quasi-jungles. Everyone of every race is the loser, most of all the blacks, whose anti-social behavior and learning handicaps are a basic cause of the problem.

As the number of unassimilable minorities increases in every

Western country, demographics alone makes school desegregation much more difficult. In the United States forced busing has put an unbearable financial load on many public school systems. The heavy concentration of minorities in inner cities works effectively against integration, with the result that segregation is now more common than integration in most metropolitan public schools. What necessity and simple demographics command, courts have a hard time overruling. The current trend is back to segregated classrooms—and there seems to be little that dedicated desegregationists can do about it.

More than a few black educators, having given up on integrated schools, are trying to replace distraught female teachers, white and black, with black males. They claim, correctly, that since most black children are brought up in female-headed families they have had little contact with men. Some psychologists believe that the lack of black male role models in and out of the classroom is one reason for black educational failures.

Although this claim may or may not be true, what is true is that an obvious first step in solving the problems of black education and the equally serious problems encountered by whites in integrated schools is the separation of races. Black frustration over failure to compete scholastically with whites would end because the competition would end. The egos of minority members could be fed with inflated history without deflating white history. Many other disadvantages of racially mixed student bodies, such as the incessant racial *bagarres* in and out of class, would become no more than disturbing memories.

Higher education in the hard sciences should only be available to those who qualify. To become a physicist, chemist or engineer in the present-day United States, talent is not infrequently a less important qualification than being a black or an Hispanic, though it is precisely the members of these two categories who, on average, are least capable of doing well in such disciplines.

In an age when science and technology hold all the trumps in warfare, the brightest Asians, Arabs and Europeans are jam-

packing physics, chemistry and engineering courses in American institutions of higher learning, while qualified whites are cheated out of scientific careers by exploding tuition costs and by quotas which permit less qualified minorities to attend the nation's best universities, often on four-year scholarships. Because racial discrimination in higher education falls disproportionately on white males, fewer of them enroll each year, not just in scientific graduate schools but in all graduate schools.

Philosophical Pathways. If we had been privileged to stroll through the groves of academe in Ancient Greece with a philosopher like Plato, who assigned a high priority to ethics, we might have heard him suggest that the most effective way to influence people to live moral lives was not to teach or preach morality, but to persuade them to *breed* morality. A bad environment stimulates unethical behavior. But so do bad genes. The Jukes family saddled America with six generations of criminals.

To improve our moral caliber, we must first improve man himself. The outer man, despite the claims of psychoanalysis, is a fairly close reflection of what goes on inside. Providing better sets of genes by genetic engineering and halting the transmission of criminal traits by sterilization are two means of promoting moral behavior that should prove more effective than the Ten Commandments.

Philosophers come in all shapes and sizes: idealists, logical positivists, ontologists, empiricists and existentialists, to name a few. Westerners have even had the opportunity (seldom seized) to read the works of a few philosophical anthropologists since mid-century. But where are our philosophical geneticists, the deep thinkers who ponder not on the eternal forms of the soul, but on the forms of those astounding, almost invisible human templates called genes? They may combine and recombine and multiply and divide, but as long as one organism remains on earth, some genes will remain. The same genetic material that "lived" in the cells of Cro-Magnon man is "living" in his modern descendants. We talk a blue streak about immor-

tality without ever having produced a single piece of credible evidence that such a boon—or curse—exists. Yet our bodies are overflowing with an estimated 100,000 genes which, if we have children, will survive in them and in their children's children and so on down the chain of generations. This may not be conscious immortality, but it is immortality of a sort.

Genes are minuscule design factories whose production lines would be quite busy in a world of ethnostates. The One World so dearly desired and endlessly touted by liberals and egalitarians would greatly reduce the variety of human genes, both dominant and recessive, as the human population amalgamated into one race. In any event, the continuity of the human race would not be at stake, unless the doomsayers of nuclear winter are right and an insane lapse of statesmanship fulfills their grim forecasts.

The question of a monoracial or multiracial fate for man is a made-to-order subject for modern philosophers, though we hear hardly a peep out of them on these vital matters. The philosophers of previous centuries did not have the technical expertise to assess the genetic benefits of an ethnostate, genetics being a study well beyond their reach. Modern philosophers, on the other hand, while they have a mass of newly acquired scientific knowledge at their disposal, show little interest in addressing questions linking genetics and statecraft.

Having spent much of our short existence riding on a philosophical merry-go-round, only rarely do we catch a brass ring. That things are different from what they seem rouses us—like it roused the ancients—to dig deeper into the enigma of existence. No matter how far we dig, however, what we perceive will ultimately be channeled into our senses. When there is a wide gap between the phenomenon and the noumenon, between the real and the apparent size of the sun, our senses can be overridden by instruments and reason. In most acts of perception, however, the brain remains the prisoner of our senses. Even if we cannot directly observe objects as small as genes, we are ready to concede their existence. Bishop Berkeley's ideas are no longer in fashion.

The instruments designed to probe inside the chromosome

and to expand our vision to the outer limits of space, the electron microscope and the radio telescope, never cease to amaze us with new discoveries. If man had selectively bred for sharper vision over 50 millennia, some of us might now have the built-in eye power to perform such visual miracles. But now that extreme nearsightedness has been achieved technically, optical Darwinism would serve no real purpose.

Our senses being our main conduits to the empyrean realm of thought, even in this day of atomic measuring and infrared photography, our gut perceptions cannot be easily dismissed. Nevertheless, it is time to put a stop to this senseless (an appropriate adjective!) bickering over appearance and reality. In science there is the measured and the measurer, as in philosophy there is the thought and the thinker. We live in a world of complementarity.

Some day we may be able to identify the different matrices of neurons that induce different races to have varying levels of affection and disaffection for nominalism and realism. By now it should be understood that the populations of ethnostates will differ in the way they face the mysteries of Being. The censorship, fear and fanaticism that historically have done so much to muzzle philosophers should disappear when it is agreed that philosophical schools have or should have separate homelands. Despite all the high-minded talk, philosophical disputes often have an undeniable racial tilt. Some ethnic groups have the capacity for abstract thought; others want "only the facts, ma'am." To stir these different groups in the same demographic pot might cause it to boil over, as has happened frequently in the past. It is difficult to philosophize while immersed in a caldron of violence.

All human societies are composed of skeptics and believers. When orthodoxy smothers skepticism, the social order hardens. When the reverse occurs, we have ferment, sometimes revolution. When skepticism and faith are in equilibrium, we are positioned for modulated change or harmonic evolution. Unmitigated skepticism denigrates or destroys most social values, including some that are vital to civilization. Total submission to orthodoxy, which tends to decelerate neurons, may

put us in reverse.

We should nourish the work attitudes that have moved us upward and repudiate the critics and levelers who denigrate Western industriousness. We must come to recognize and understand our inherited capabilities so we can put them to effective use. We cannot transform ourselves and still remain "us," but we can always improve, reshape and hone our political and cultural aptitudes. Superior talent bestowed by nature and perfected by nurture is not an assurance of genius, but at the very least it should propel its fortunate possessors to the edge of this exalted category. Unfortunately man, even the most gifted man, will be compelled to operate within the human orbit until such time as positive evolution jumps him to a higher one. In the meantime, we should stretch our human limitations almost to the breaking point in preparation for a possible quantum leap into a new and more intelligent species.

Revolutionaries and Philosophers. It is the habit of the professional revolutionary and the professional criminal to jeopardize every social order. The former pretends to strive for society's "good." The latter, having no valid excuse for his unlawful activity, is less hypocritical. Committed to any violent means to achieve their ends, both the revolutionary and the criminal have lost their footing on the evolutionary ladder and stepped down a few rungs, as they pull everyone else down with them.

The professional revolutionaries must be persuaded to adopt enough of a skeptical philosophy to question only what is questionable and enough of an accommodating philosophy to accept only what is acceptable. Much depends on character. So many of us, too many of us, have an itch for instant power and riches. But how many deserve such rewards? Those who are deserving should be actively assisted. Those who are not should not be tantalized with high expectations. Today, the careers of the more deserving are often sacrificed on the altar of affirmative action and minority agitprop. The squeaking wheels that get the grease have become earsplitting.

Nothing is more destructive to social equilibrium than the

widespread perception that the undeserving are rewarded and the deserving penalized. The undeserving must be made to understand that by never ceasing to bend "the public ear" with animadversions against "racism," they are revolutionaries *in piccolo*. They manage to get away with this racial racketeering because in heterogeneous societies, instead of being criticized and denounced, they are more likely to be praised.

An ethnostate can afford to keep orthodoxy and skepticism in better balance than can multiracial states, which favor the skeptic at the expense of society as a whole. The gravitational pull of homogeneity overcomes the negative forces of divisiveness and fragmentation that would otherwise have skeptics flying off in all directions.

What must the philosophy of the ethnostate be? Its direction and content should come out of a blend of experience and imagination, a twin set of prerequisites that adds up to open and agile minds. Whatever line or lines of thought emerge, they should not be allowed to coagulate into a constellation of hardened ideologies.

Philosophy is the rough map of a territory made by a person who has never been there. When the surveyor and his equipment arrive on the scene, no matter how brilliantly the philosopher has drawn upon his considerable powers of deduction and induction, his map will not compare in accuracy to the one mapped by instruments. But when a surveyor is not available, or until he is available, philosophy has a leading role to play in the upper reaches of human thought.

The wilder hypotheses of the early Greek nature philosophers crumbled before the power of rudimentary Greek science. Plato's archetypes still exercise some influence, though they have been expanded almost beyond recognition by Carl Jung. As medical research plumbs deeper and deeper into the functioning of the brain, the writings of Plato and Jung on the soul are becoming totally outmoded and relegated to the nebulous realm of childish guesswork.

Our animal nature forces us to obey the laws of nature. But part of our humanity derives from pretending we are not animals. As long as our fertile and irrepressible imagination does

not lead us into psychological wildernesses that disturb or threaten our health and mental balance, then more power to our power of thought—and to us.

A front-burner mission of education in an ethnostate or any state is to teach students to recognize the dividing line between the real and the ideal, while inspiring them to stake out large claims in both areas. It is when we fail to recognize this boundary or refuse to admit its existence that our minds begin to stumble.

To recapitulate, the ethnostate should have no state philosophy. It should encourage the pursuit of philosophy, so long as it is understood to be an exercise of the imagination, not a rulebook of life. No one knows the truth, philosophers often least of all. But there is little harm and occasionally great profit in the search. Although no philosopher has ever inhabited the Kingdom of the Wise, his brushes with wisdom occasionally get him as far as the Kingdom's gates.

Some philosophers have developed the habit of putting themselves above science, considering it *infra dig*. The logical positivists now holding forth so stridently in academia condescendingly bring up the subject of science, as a prelude to denigrating it. One of the most furious of this breed, Sir Karl Popper, has even attempted to show that science, at least in respect to the various theories that underpin it, is thoroughly "unscientific."

Although they may recognize human differences and a few, like Hegel, have even considered some races to be subhuman, philosophers, ancient and modern, have mainly addressed their lucubrations to the world at large, not to a geographic or demographic segment of it. For a philosopher in the late 20th century to propound a system of thought based all or in part on race would be tantamount to academic suicide. Elitist philosophies may be propounded by such wizards of punditry as Nietzsche and Santayana, but without any serious effort to assign or confine their disciples to any anthropological category.

To put it another way, the West has reached a stage where philosophers are either not interested in developing philoso-

phies specifically for Westerners or dare not do so for fear of being branded nativists. This fear is obviously impoverishing philosophical speculation. The mind boggles at the wealth of ideas that might spring from philosophers exploring the liberating effects that ethnostates might have on the human condition.

Contemporary philosophers avoid the differences and dwell on the similarities of *Homo sapiens*. This rigid conformity must bear some responsibility for the narrow range of modern philosophical studies. Despite the naysayers, censors and monitors who wish to keep philosophy in the deep freeze of liberalism and anti-racism, philosophical musings about genetics do not necessarily lead to holocausts. On the contrary, they expand the horizon of thought.

Since philosophers are human, like all humans they are the products of environmentally modulated genes. Different soils contain different nutrients which make possible the world's profusion of flora. The genetic differences of population groups, which make possible the world's profusion of the category of fauna known as man, combined with the variances in geography and culture, provide the assorted intellectual nutrients for the development of an exciting new field of study—philosophical genetics.

Chapter 10

On the Evolutionary Track

Natural Selection. Evolution either moves forward or, when the brakes are applied, slips easily into reverse. The watchword of every intelligent human being should be, "Give evolution its head." Evolution is the kind of horse that runs longer and faster with a loose rein. There is always danger in letting it go, but there may be more danger in trying to stop it.

Humanitarianism is perhaps the greatest "drag" on evolution because it defers to altruistic considerations that are not always in man's best interests. More often than not, humanitarianism does not advance man; it seeks only to protect him. If the rights of the group and the individual clash, humanitarians commonly side with the latter. Since evolution is the work of races and species, not individuals, humanitarians look askance at it and will even go so far as to denounce Darwin and uphold the discredited doctrine of Lamarck, who believed acquired characteristics could be inherited.

As Raymond Cattell has suggested, man should not be encouraged to remain a single biological species. When a genus is comprised of only one or two species, it may be headed for extinction. When it comes to extinction, races decay somewhat like radioisotopes, that is, they never quite lose all their energy. Smaller and smaller traces of their genes will probably last as long as human life lasts. The half-life of races never quite converges to zero.

Darwinism is actually five theories in one. At a time when,

partly due to a new outburst of wild-eyed creationism and partly due to the sniping of Marxist biologists, thinking about evolution is growing fuzzier, it might be wise to go back to the source—to the grand evolutionist himself. This is how Darwin summarized Darwinism:

1. Evolution — all organic and inorganic matter is in a continuous, differentially accelerated process of change.
2. Common descent — all organisms have emerged from a few simple organisms by the process of branching.
3. Gradualness — discontinuity or gaps in evolution are due to extinction of intermediate types and slow divergences that cannot be fully revealed by the meager historical record.
4. Natural selection — the adaptation of organisms to each other and to their environment by the proliferation of the better adapted and the disappearance of the poorly adapted.
5. Speciation — the development of species by separation, isolation and genetic drift.

Natural selection and speciation, items 4 and 5, are now working to man's disadvantage, not to his advantage. As always, human beings are adapting as best they can, but today in most countries the adaptation is retrogressive. Worldwide transportation and communications networks have made speciation, which depends on separatism, more difficult. Only the most remote parts of the globe and the most remote tribes still remain isolated. A local idea can now be transformed into a global idea in a matter of days. Speciation is not furthered by ecumenical propaganda.

Faustian impulses can be interpreted as a striving for variation—in the sense of Herbert Spencer's view of evolution as a march from the simple to the complex. Conceding that the more complex the organism the greater its need of energy, it may be that highly sophisticated organisms will some day reach such a level of complexity that no amount of energy will suffice to make them viable. Is a cycle at work here, a pulsation on the order of the Big Bang? Will some forms of life become so intricate they will finally run out of evolutionary

steam, since they will have to devote all their energy to maintaining, not increasing, their complexity? Is it possible that at some point evolution will back up and move from the complex to the simple? Already there are signs that man is retreating to a lower energy level. If this is not happening, many of our leading politicians are acting as if they want it to happen. Supine behavior by the elite is evidence that evolutionary forces are at least being dampened.

If we are entering a phase of reverse evolution, will it be short-lived? It may be that we are being caught up in a ground swell which will sweep us back into a cold, lifeless, pre-Cambrian age. Without the evolutionary dynamic—a force so strong that it was able to create the organic out of the inorganic—speciation may have to close up shop.

Mother Nature weeds out failed societies along with the elites responsible for the failure. Though it retards progress, this winnowing process may be the best kind of survival insurance. A breathing spell is well worth the loss of time—an insignificant loss in view of the billions of years the earth is scheduled to endure. If the wreckers were able to survive the society they wrecked, if there was no "time out" for natural selection to replace the failures with "succeeders," human intelligence might nose-dive. Who knows if the transition from ape to man could ever be repeated?

Science and mathematics, both in regard to their form, perception and use, may differ from race to race (see Oswald Spengler's *Decline of the West*). Time and space do not mean the same things to everyone. Just as the two sexes have important differences in brain structure, so do races. Differently structured brains cannot be expected to develop one all-embracing scientific worldview any more than different body structures can be expected to produce the same levels of physical performance.

The racial differences revealed by IQ and other tests should be taken seriously by laymen as well as by professionals. These differences should be applauded instead of downgraded, as current fashion dictates. It is these differences, not the similarities, which will inch man further up the evolutionary totem

pole. Speciation and isolation are the tried and proven ways to positive evolution—the mechanism that got us here.

One of this study's most persistent themes is that widespread racial integration may prove to be an irreversible disaster. Man evolved precisely because of his variety and the speciation to which variety gave rise. Group differences, not group similarities, have set the stage for the evolutionary dynamics that in a few billion years articulated protozoa into a Newton.

If variety is the spice of life, it is also the dynamic of life. One vast agglomeration of men and women, spread across the width and breadth of the globe, all possessing closely related physical and mental traits—one large blob of humanity with everyone living, looking and thinking alike—would turn the world into a giant equality sign that would signal the advent of reverse evolution.

Onward and Upward. No matter what we call ourselves, no matter how distant we feel we are removed from other primates, we all possess or are possessed by certain primeval residues. Some of our behavior might shock our cavemen ancestors. A very few of us act almost 100% human, meaning that we manage to keep most of our animal nature under wraps. This is all to the good because we cannot reasonably expect to reach a higher evolutionary plateau until we are able to put our mind in charge of our instincts. Nature sees to it that our bodies take care of themselves, as long as we do not deliberately indulge in self-destruction with drugs and other health-threatening vices. It is our minds that need all the tender care and attention we can afford to give them.

It has been fairly well established that the human brain has not increased in size since the time of Cro-Magnon man. Like muscles, brains thrive on exercise. Constant challenges keep the mind pumping. If modern civilization, in spite of the frequent outbursts of barbarism, makes life too easy and too secure, then the brain is bound to stagnate.

Although the contemporary world of media banality, the so-called real world, reminds us constantly of our "lower nature," our nonsensual and nonsensate make-up calls upon us

to use our brain, not for solving day-to-day problems (job worries, family disputes, sex matters) but for striving to understand the "big problem," for mulling over what "the all" is all about. It is obvious that the state of mind that energizes deep thought is most easily attained when we are able to shrug off the "real world." Nothing, it must be said, keeps the brain in better shape, more on the *qui vive* than a long stint of reflection.

Many religious denominations require "retreats" for their priests and ministers. History is full of anecdotes about hermits and monks who retired to the wilderness to commune one-on-one with their god or gods. In their autobiographies or diaries famous statesmen have recorded how they wrestled laboriously with their conscience before they made the important decisions that shaped the destiny of their countries. Mystics have discoursed long and seriously on the spiritual benefits obtained from trances. All of the people involved, as far as can be ascertained, were well aware, that though their time-outs for soul-searching interrupted their careers, sometimes at great cost, the ultimate gain outweighed the temporary loss.

Darwin to the Rescue. Natural selection works in tandem with environment. In an immoral society those most fit for survival would be immoralists. In a moral society moral individuals would have the best chance of passing on their genes. If we wish to select for certain traits, such as honesty and intelligence, then we must provide an environment that will allow people with such traits to survive and proliferate. As the science of genetics becomes more exact, we ought to be able to breed character like any other trait. The dour and industrious Northern European, the extroverted Southern European, the rhythm-loving Negro and the inscrutable Chinese may be stereotypes, but stereotypes had to start somewhere. They may be advertised and promoted by bigoted minds, but they were not invented by bigots.

The ethnostate should be spartan in its treatment of citizens, in particular its young citizens, always spurring them on, never letting them rest, forever testing their mettle by placing all sorts

of roadblocks in the paths of their careers. Family and state must cooperate, even conspire, to see to it that no citizen, until he is well past middle age, ever stops training for a life constantly attuned to overcoming obstacles.

To keep evolution on track, the ethnostate should present its citizens with challenges of the same intensity that faced early man. A way has to be found to keep natural selection operational while removing its brutality. The first step might be to drill into every man, woman and child the Kiplingesque and Heideggerian proposition that "life is serious," so serious that the moment one hurdle in a person's education and career has been cleared, he should be presented with another. If this lifelong schedule of mental flexing is adopted by appreciable segments of mankind, the challenges may exceed in number and direction, if not in intensity, those that in the distant past resulted in the explosion of brain size.

The large multiracial state is plainly not the place for this mind-toughening regimen. The principal concern of such a state is to keep the peace, to reduce the brawling of its motley population to a minimum, and to divert its people with bread and circuses, thereby making life easier, not harder, for all and sundry. Besides, any program aimed at increasing the evolutionary potential of the citizenry of a multiracial state would be denounced as elitist by professional equalitarians, who would quickly discover or pretend to discover that one or another ethnic group was being disproportionately favored.

Giant of a Man. Darwin is a quasar in the firmament of human ingenuity. In addition to his theory of evolution, he acknowledged what is currently unacknowledgeable except in whispers, namely, that there are racial differences in evolutionary grade. If he were alive today, such ideas would have destroyed his professional credibility, leaving his seminal theories to fall on deaf ears.

Although Darwin's theories did more to destroy some of the most prevalent Christian myths, he led an exemplary Christian life. Modest and unpretentious, even when he knew he had all the voluminous data he needed, he was still shy about pub-

lication. He was not the headline-hunting scientist of today who announces some sensational new theory or discovery in press releases, but somehow never gets around to checking out his claims. Darwin's method was in the best tradition of Western science: brilliant bouts of induction after decades of empirical digging—and then and only then publishing his findings

The attacks by Christian fundamentalists and latter-day Stalinists on Darwin and the strictures placed by liberals on genetic research demonstrate once again an innate, widespread fear of science, even in what is sometimes called the Scientific Age.

The empirically minded Westerner looks askance at the social scientists who pay more attention to theory than experiment and have an abhorrence of laboratories. Biological explanations of behavior are developed and ready at hand to supplant the Marxist and environmental theories which have dominated the social sciences for most of this century. Sociobiology, as its name implies, accents the "nature" component of group behavior. For daring to swim against the "nurturist" tide, sociobiologist E.O. Wilson was doused with water at a meeting of Harvard radicals.

There is no reason why the sciences, soft and hard, social and physical, could not prosper in an ethnostate. The stumbling blocks which work to science's detriment, such as politically mandated limits on research and penalties for publishing sensitive racial data, would be conspicuous by their absence. Scientists in all fields, particularly in the biological sciences, would be allowed to pursue their investigations, no matter where they might lead, no matter how controversial the results. No other form of statecraft would give the search for truth such a green light.

Chapter 11

Futurology

Folk Wandering. America will never be resuscitated in the form it has known during most of its existence. Nonwhites, together with legal and illegal immigrants, most of whom are also nonwhite, have moved into many of the nation's largest metropolises, where they are reproducing at a rate which has already colorized the inner cities. The question arises: How effectively are these minorities administering these megalopolises? The answer: Law and order in America's largest municipalities is breaking down to the point where economic and social chaos is propelling nonwhites into the white inner suburbs, which in turn is driving whites to flee to the outer suburbs and rural areas.

The picture is not a pretty one, but it has some positive features. As whites become ever more besieged, they are migrating in ever larger numbers to areas that could be the nuclei of white ethnostates. This enforced togetherness is influencing them to develop a closer, deeper and richer attachment to the culture that used to be theirs until large parts of it were submerged in the flood of pluralism now engulfing the 50 states. As far as millions of Americans are concerned, their country has already passed into alien hands. All that is left to them is the remembrance of better times, some history, some fossilized institutions and some remnants of their genetic inheritance. This is hardly enough to stand up to the crusading counterculture of permissive liberalism, a rabid, pro-minority media and

the institutionalized antiwhite racism known as affirmative action.

The logistics of the population transfers previously alluded to may well be accelerated by "historical surprises." Racial rioting on the grand scale would move huge blocs of people almost overnight. Massive economic dislocation and unemployment in the industrial states would trigger a slow but steady exodus to greener pastures. If more than 10 million Germans could be herded hundreds of miles westward in a few months, as happened in 1945-46 in war-ravaged Europe, even greater numbers of people could be transported with even more speed with the help of more advanced forms of mass transportation. Another World War II migration was Stalin's enforced transfer of the Volga Germans and other nationality groups to Soviet Asia after the German invasion of the U.S.S.R. in 1941. The flight of a million or more Palestinians from what is now Israel in 1947-48 was still another quick-step *Völkerwanderung*. The great northward trek of the Boers in South Africa in the last century also comes to mind.

Regrouping and relocating 240 million Americans into ethnostates may seem to be in the realm of fantasy. Considering the huge population deplacements that have taken place elsewhere in recent times, demographic reshuffling on a similar scale is not altogether out of the range of possibility

Perpetual Opposition. Jews, who usually do well financially and politically when their host countries put the quietus on nationalism, have reservations about the ethnostate concept, except when it applies to Israel. At first glance the Zionist state is the realization of age-old hopes and dreams of those Jews longing to return to the homeland their ancestors left nearly two millennia ago. But Israel, unlike certain European regions and provinces, such as Burgundy and Flanders, does not have a thousand-year-old uninterrupted tradition of cultural autonomy and complete or partial independence, a tradition that overshadows their history as appendages of France and Belgium. Moreover, the creation of Burgundy and Flanders did not require driving out and confiscating the property of a

million or more inhabitants.

Israel was foisted on a land of non-Jews by force of arms and money. Unless and until passions cool and Palestinians and their Arab and Islamic supporters can be induced to accept a Zionist political entity as a next-door neighbor, Israel will have to remain on a permanent war footing, ready to fight at a moment's notice for its existence. This is not a safe and solid base on which to build an enduring social order of any kind, let alone an ethnostate, notwithstanding Israel's bulging stockpile of nuclear weapons and the all-out support from America's two major political parties.

Israel, however, is only part of a broader problem that faces world Jewry. The international dispersion of Jews, their presence in high places in so many countries, runs counter to the ethnostate concept. A political philosophy that emphasizes human differences does not sit well with a people long dedicated to the promotion of internationalism.

Ironically, almost everything Jews strenuously oppose in their host countries—racial or ethnic discrimination of any kind, civil rights violations, terrorism, nationalism, state-supported religion, majoritarian rule—flourish in Israel.

There is little doubt that Jews, wherever they are found, would be in the front line of the opposition to any serious ethnostate movement. Many influential Negro leaders would likely join the Jews, believing, but not admitting, that blacks, left to their own devices, would be sorely pressed to establish a successful ethnostate or any state on the Western model at this point in time. As proved by the dismal history of their African habitats, blacks have much to learn in the art of statecraft. Searching for ways to overcome the combined Jewish and black opposition, ethnostatists would probably debate the merits and demerits of a one-front or two-front strategy. Some would advocate engaging the Negroes first and bypassing Jews on the basis that it is wiser to defeat the weaker enemy before going after the stronger. Ethnostate advocates would argue that Jews and Negroes would not be taken in by this *divide et impera* strategy, so both should be confronted simultaneously

But criticizing Jews and Negroes is not a healthy activity in

the present-day Western world. The so-called impact media can easily ruin the reputation of anyone from a president on down who adopts a negative attitude to these two powerful minorities. Western politicians have learned to their sorrow that a disparaging headline that even hints of anti-Semitic and anti-black sentiments can be more dangerous to their career than a mugger's knife.

Despite some occasional anti-Semitic outbursts by black radicals, Jews and Negroes are either willing or unwilling allies. Jews, it will be recalled, played a leading role in financing and directing the civil rights crusade that lifted American Negroes out of political obscurity and transformed them into a powerful minority. Jews were in the forefront of the campaign to lift long-established immigration quotas, to open the gates that filled American cities with fellow Jews, Southern Europeans, Hispanics and Asians, that filled British cities with West Indians, Asian Indians and Pakistanis, German cities with Turks and French cities with Algerians and black Africans.

An ethnostate has room for only one race. Although the relocation of 30 million American Negroes in the United States and millions of blacks and other minorities in Europe would present massive logistical problems, the relocating of Jews would not. The state of Israel is waiting for them with open arms. Those Jews who don't want to go there—the majority of Jews—could be given enclaves in any number of the New World and Old World countries in which they are now congregated. Long Island, just across the East River from Manhattan, the center of the diaspora's financial power, would make an ideal Jewish ethnostate.

White Knight. Recent events in what was once the Soviet Union have given a tremendous boost to the ethnostate idea. If the rest of the white world sinks into barbarism or dies out by massive miscegenation and genocidally low reproductive rates, Russia and other Slavic spinoffs—Ukraine, Belarus, with perhaps a few more in the offing—are well positioned to produce a healthy population of whites quite capable of safeguarding the Slavs' modified form of Western civilization. So even if

worse comes to worst, all may not be lost. Eastern European ethnostates arising from the ashes of a collapsed Marxist empire may be ready, willing and able to take up the cause of Western civilization so pitifully abandoned by its founders. The one complicating factor in the ethnic regrouping is the scattering of Russians throughout the non-Russian parts of the defunct Communist imperium.

Greatly reduced in size and population, two Russian ethnostates, one in Europe, another in Siberia, either separately or together, could emerge as a stronger power than their predecessor, the stagnant, overcentralized Soviet Union of unblessed memory. A homogeneous state relieved of the burden of lording it over a multiplicity of vassal republics is a healthier, stronger and more enduring political entity than a sprawling, disjointed empire held together by brute force.

The breakup of the Soviet Union could be a powerful model for other population groups who wish to strike out on their own. If the devolution of the Baltic States, of Moldavia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan and the Moslem states in Asia, takes place without too much violence and mayhem, if the Soviet spinoffs manage to make a go of their newly acquired independence, the citizens of Britain, France, Germany, Spain, Canada, the United States and other Western countries might come to see the many advantages inherent in devolution. Self-determination has always been the most sensible and intelligent axiom of politics. How many foreign and civil wars would not have been fought, how many revolutions would have been avoided, how many millions of human lives saved, if this basic principle of statecraft had been observed from the day a couple of paleolithic families first got together and worked out the glimmerings of tribal government?

In Constant Touch. History makes it very plain that when cities get too big, urban populations look to the countryside for talent. Urbanization appears to have a deadening effect on the offspring of born-and-bred city folk. The urban imbalance is more serious in some small countries, where the ratio of the urban population to suburbanites and ruralists is even more

pronounced than in large states. When small nations succumb to urban sprawl, there is hardly any countryside left from which to draw new blood or more gray matter.

Ethnostates would be dedicated to keeping the city-side-countryside proportion in reasonable balance. Now that high-tech communications enable remote rural communities to be in instant touch with the world at large, one of the most important functions of the city is disappearing. Today, nearly everyone in the developed countries is or can be in a worldwide communications network of one form or another. The 24-hour electronic outpouring of gigabyte data bases that can be picked up by anyone with a phone line, modem and computer has all but ended the isolation that was such a handicap to people in remote areas.

Not so long ago it was necessary for a nation's elite to reside in the political and financial center of the country to get anything done. Business had to be conducted in large cities, because only there could entrepreneurs get financing for their companies and find the experienced personnel to run them. Today, the headquarters of a corporation can function almost as well in a remote mountain hamlet as in a municipal skyscraper. Only heavy industry with its need for a huge workforce must still be located near transportation networks and population centers, though it is quite possible that robots will put an end to this outmoded concentration of labor pools.

An ethnostate might well be the first cityless state. Like most businesses, government can now be run just as efficiently—perhaps more efficiently—from suburban office complexes as from large, unwieldy agglomerates of bureaucrats herded together in massive neo-Greek bureaucratic hives in some vast megalopolis.

Tomorrow's Europe. European unity is an old dream that a few dreamers and schemers have tried—and failed—to make come true. There have been some serious and half-serious attempts in the past—Charlemagne, one or two Holy Roman Emperors, Napoleon and latterly Hitler. But for most of history the inhabitants of the peninsular continent have preferred

to snipe, scrap and war with each other rather than unite. At the moment, the greatest incentive for pulling together is the growing desire of Europeans to escape the orbit of the one remaining superpower. (As long as Russia, the principal heir of the Soviet Union, controls some 13,000 nuclear warheads, it must be accorded quasi-superpower status.)

Now that the Soviet Union has collapsed and in the process has shed its Eastern European satellites, many Europeans, believing the Cold War to be over, would like to say good-bye to the American armed forces, once all Russian troops are out of Poland, Czechoslovakia and what for more than four decades was called East Germany. More pragmatic Europeans believe that as long as Russia has a huge arsenal of nuclear weapons and is in a period of dangerous instability, it would be wiser for American troops to remain in place.

Russian leaders would be very pleased with a neutralized Europe, *sans* the U.S. military presence. But should Russia become stridently nationalist, fascist or get caught up in pan-Slavism, always possibilities in that neurotic land mass, this might expose non-Russian Europe to a military attack from the east that Western and Central European powers could not successfully resist by themselves and might not attempt to resist. If properly armed, however, a federation of European ethnostates with something more to defend than a collection of old-line, decadent ochlocracies ought to be able to withstand or scare off any Russian or Slavic assault with or without the assistance of the United States,

Nationalism has long been a source of festering disputes and wars that have practically decimated the European population. In pre-nationalist times, Europe was a mosaic of provinces, all with distinct characteristics. It is in these provinces that the real strength and vitality of Europe have always rested. It is in these provinces, resuscitated and reorganized as ethnostates, that European culture may once again break sensational new ground in art, music, literature, philosophy and science.

Beyond Tomorrow. How many nonwhite countries have given equal rights to whites and, if so, for how long? Past and

current history produces few examples. When it comes down to it, whites do rather poorly in nonwhite states, now that the age of colonization is history. Governments of nonwhite countries are seldom tolerant and hardly ever democratic. In the U.S., where whites are still supposed to be in the driver's seat, nonwhites, with the assistance of white liberals and some white minorities, have managed to enact laws that actually discriminate against whites in jobs, education and public housing. If this can occur when nonwhites are still in the minority, what will America be like when they outnumber whites?

Gloomy forebodings of what whites in Western countries with huge black populations may face can be limned in Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*. One way to safeguard the rights and physical well-being of outnumbered whites in a mixed-race or nonwhite nation would be to resort to the intermittent Latin American practice of securing white survival by white or mostly white military juntas or dictatorships. Although those who have not been to Cuba in recent decades may disbelieve it, Fidel Castro's absolutist regime, at least in the top echelons, is considerably whiter than the White House-approved Batista government that *el máximum lider* overthrew.

Any sensible discussion of the future, of the bleak as well as the rosy alternatives, must include what effect our increasing knowledge of the inner and outer world, the genome and deep space, may have on the human psyche.

Is it possible that a surfeit of knowledge lowers morale and the will to live? When the immediate problems of politics, economics and technology are cleared up, when we seem to be on the way to solving the more intricate riddles of life and death, the world may be revealed as more of an enemy than a friend.

Despite the scaremongers, who receive big helpings of money and reams of publicity for prophesying the imminent end of the world, it is doubtful that a full-scale nuclear war, at least in this stage of fusion and fission weapons, would put an end to civilization and, as some eschatologists like to say, all life on earth. Consider New Zealand, Iceland, even Argentina—any of these countries is capable of carrying on the basic core of Western civilization and culture.

According to some futurologists, the end times for the United States and perhaps for other Western countries will follow one of these scenarios:

(a) As soon as nonwhites outnumber whites in previously white countries, the prevailing form of government, as history so eloquently testifies, will switch from representative government to a military or tribal dictatorship which will lead the West back to a new Dark Age.

(b) Radical Marxist regimes will terrorize restless, heterogeneous masses to substitute class hatred for their racial hostilities, thereby making it possible to install a dictatorship of the proletariat which will hold on to its power and privileges by handing over ever greater sums of the country's diminishing wealth to nonwhites.

(c) A breakup of the West along racial lines, accompanied by a large-scale relocation of populations, will confine Europeans and their descendants overseas to a much smaller living space. This is the only course of events which could eventually lead to a world or continent of white and nonwhite ethnostates, thereby allowing Western civilization to survive in microcosm, if not in macrocosm.

Westerners in the U.S. and elsewhere can really never be confident of carrying on the Great Adventure into ethnostatism until their present psychological makeup is radically altered. It is not that they are too much at the mercy of their instincts. It is that their instincts are unbalanced. They seem to revel in what they consider—wrongly—to be their best instinct, their overabundance of altruism, which is exactly what has been prodding them along the road to self-destruction.

Let us not deceive ourselves that because most of us are not hungry when we go to bed, that because our homes stay snug and dry when storms and cold fronts move in, that because most of us somehow hang onto our jobs, all is well. Some of the healthiest-looking individuals we pass in the street have cancers, real or psychological, rotting away their bodies or minds. History teaches us that appearances can be quite de-

ceptive, that political, economic and social collapse can strike as unexpectedly and as destructively as lightning. If we prepare now for the inevitable, if we can piece together a coherent plan for future action, we will have a leg up on chaos when comes the crunch.

Of Genes and Things. It is customary when talking or writing about future organizations of society to come out with strident, detailed menus of what should or should not be done. Much of this is a waste of time since the future seldom fits scenarios dreamed up by writers living in the present. All futurologists, however, should have the key obligation of proposing ways to protect the gene pools of their respective races and population groups. No people should let its unique biological treasure be lost or diluted to where it can never be recovered. Whatever prevents this from happening is right; whatever lets it happen is wrong. Such are the bare bones of an ethnostate manifesto.

To reach the point where we put the ethnostate above all other forms of statehood, ancient and modern, will take some doing. Win or lose, it will be a productive and enlightening fight. It qualifies as a fight for freedom because the greatest and most important freedom is the freedom to survive.

The planet earth is fast becoming an overcrowded hothouse in which a chaotic multitude of flowers, instead of blossoming, are literally killing each other off. Whole forests are disappearing, along with thousands of plant species, as "civilization" rumbles on with its bulldozers, graders, cement mixers and caravans of asphalt trucks.

The most attractive gardens are those alive with different colors. Flowers look their best in separate clumps so their unique traits are multiplied and magnified for the greater pleasure of gardeners. When many varieties of flowers are scattered haphazardly, there is a mass of color, but no form—no opportunity to enjoy the different varieties separately, as the traveler enjoys the different cultures that unfold when he passes from one country to another.

Chairman Mao Tse-tung said in a rare, oracular moment,

"Let a thousand flowers blossom." Later, he proceeded to cut down not only the flowers, but the gardeners as well. If he had let his gardens flourish and grow, he might be remembered as a pioneering ethnostatist, instead of just another antiwhite Marxist autocrat.

Genetic Forecasting. Genes must have some direct links to the state of mind that steers culture in certain directions. Otherwise, after some 60 years of concentrated indoctrination, all Westerners would now be liberals. How can it be that so many of us still put more trust in our feelings than in what the educational system, the government and the media tell us? If environment is the overwhelming determinant of behavior and thought, as so many modern schools of sociology and psychology allege, every vestige of anti-liberalism would have long since been expunged from the Western mind.

Man has always been a partner of nature in directing human evolution. Now he is becoming the senior partner. Despite the Sermon on the Mount, aggression, when properly controlled, is a beneficial trait. But it must be transformed into aggression *for* man instead of aggression *against* man. We must be programmed to war against ignorance, not against other countries; to assault the farthest corners of space, not an old lady on her way to buy groceries.

What is the harm of a "genetic report card" that lists the inborn and inherited qualities and capabilities of every infant? Where is the harm in providing the infant's parents and even the child, at the appropriate time, with a data sheet that predicts with some accuracy what courses he would do best in and what kind of career would be most suitable to his talents? Self-knowledge, an awareness of one's own strengths and weaknesses, both mental and physical, is a powerful weapon in the battle of life. Such knowledge cannot come too early for a growing child who needs to know where to apply his talents to the best effect. What better way to shorten the tremendous amount of time so many young people waste before they find the "right job."

It may soon be possible to provide a fairly accurate physical

and mental profile of human beings even while they're in the fetal stage. What is delaying the wide use of this important breakthrough is the opposition of those who refuse to accept that much of what every person accomplishes in life is determined at the first moment of conception. Just as the knowledge of a person's genetic makeup can be applied to directing him where he can make the most of his capabilities, so can the recognition of different matrices of genes of various population groups, subraces and races be useful in determining the form of politics and the type of economy appropriate for particular ethnostates.

People are different, individually and in the mass. The collective differences would be accentuated, not covered up, in ethnostates and put to work for the benefit of all concerned—in contrast to the multiracialists' attempts to play down the innate mental differences of groups and play up the superficial similarities.

Go to the Gene. Training, nutrition and other environmental factors beyond the control of nature all have a profound effect on animal and human strength. But if the basic bone structure and musculature are not there, the most strenuous conditioning and exercise will not do the necessary work. If the task is seemingly undoable, if all else fails, go to the gene—a rule already honored by horticulturalists and cattle breeders, but still anathema to most educators and politicians.

Those who stand so firmly and fanatically on the nurture side of the nature-nurture controversy have a great advantage. They are able to propound endlessly that what is deterministic is immoral. It is a powerful argument in a country and in an era bemused by morality.

But the point is, there is morality, if not more morality, on the side of the "naturists." Is it not more moral to know one's capabilities and limitations than to be ignorant of them? What is more immoral than to encourage a person to perform a task beyond his capability? A sprinter ordered to run the 100-meter dash in 11 seconds, when his best time has never been less than 13 seconds, would end up in a madhouse if, after

failing again and again, he was still ordered to keep trying.

Think of the plight of the sprinter. Then think of the nurturists who are forever pitting sharp minds against dull minds in the belief that given the same environment everyone has equal learning capabilities. Ponder the immorality of implanting roseate hopes of success in business or the professions into high-school seniors who cannot pass a simple math test.

Fanatic nurturists, believing intelligence is learned not inherited, keep preaching they want a world in which everyone is equally intelligent. They forget to mention that there is only one very impractical way to achieve this pie-in-the-sky objective—a three-step method that they would reject in horror: (1) Remove enough brain cells from the gifted so they will sink to the average intellectual level of the masses; (2) Implant these same cells in the brains of morons to bring their IQs up to 100; (3) Inaugurate a long-term child-bearing program in which intelligent spouses are encouraged to mate with unintelligent spouses until the intelligence curve of the population flattens.

There is a fourth way which, though it cannot do anything about equalizing people and races physically or mentally, at least will alleviate some of the unhappiness and frustration caused by individual and racial inequality. That is the way of separatism which confines competition to members of the same race, thus eliminating the friction caused in multiracial states by inherited group differences.

Violence is immoral. Envy is immoral. Murder, mayhem, pogroms and massacres are immoral. Nuclear, chemical and biological warfare is totally immoral. The next time a nurturist accuses a naturist of immorality because the latter believes intelligence is genetically determined, the naturist should turn the argument around and tick off the immoral consequences of foisting nurturism not only on people, but on their institutions as well. Ask a nurturist to explain why genetic engineering is bad, but social engineering is good. After much hemming and hawing, he may finally blurt out, "If you are right, then truth is immoral." At that moment, the argument ends. What the nurturist is attacking are not ideas but the Faus-

tian element in Western man.

Almost as bad as war as a winnower of the best specimens of all races is wanderlust, which puts the bravest, most energetic human beings in direct contact with indigenous peoples, a situation that almost guarantees miscegenation and all the problems that derive therefrom. What saved the British colonies in North America from the political and economic chaos that bedevils Latin America was that the British and most other white immigrants who settled in what is now Canada and the United States brought their wives and children along, or married people of their own race after their arrival. The Mediterranean peoples who came to Latin America consisted largely of single men (soldiers, gold seekers, adventurers) who expended their libido on native women.

Once the earth had been thoroughly canvassed and mapped, it was inevitable that a race infected with wanderlust would direct its energies to the exploration of space. Out there the possibility of race-mixing is almost nil, there being no one in the solar system to mate with. Perhaps in the Milky Way, but how could potential parents ever find each other?

Shifting the wanderlust of Western man to space exploration will also tend to diminish his earthbound transgressions. War has become a very serious business, what with nuclear-tipped missiles ready for button-pushers in a growing number of countries. Homicide, until recently thought of as the most egregious of crimes, has now been upstaged by genocide, a word unknown until 1944. Since the ethnostate is by definition monoracial, any full-scale attack by a foreign state on an ethnostate can be interpreted as something on the order of genocide. No nation, not even the most militaristic, wants to be accused of genocide. Consequently, even the most imperialistic generals, dictators and presidents would have to think twice before unleashing their armed forces against a peaceful ethnostate.

Chapter 12

Unguessing History

It is difficult to get a grasp on history without some understanding of the genetic and cultural parameters of the civilization or people under study. The classification and identification of genetic influences on collective human behavior, up to now sadly and often forcibly neglected, should be at the core of future historical studies, if such studies are to emerge from the tendentious level and guesswork to which they have been confined in modern times.

As taboos change, the intensity or laxity of their observance varies over the years and centuries. The particular talents of great men flourish at their full capacity where the free exercise of these talents is tolerated and often encouraged. Conversely, some important mental leaps and breakthroughs have been made in intolerant and straitlaced societies where repression and frustration have actually stimulated enterprising minds to defy the dead-weight of authority.

Who would dare say what Plato might have thought or written had he been born in 17th-century Boston? Or in Chairman Mao's China? What would Michelangelo have done if he had been born in ancient Israel where graven images were prohibited? Every artist must operate within windows of opportunity, some of which are wide open, some only slightly. Just as flowers and vegetables are dependent on the soil and climate where they are planted, humans must depend on their man-made environment for intellectual sustenance, an environment ulti-

mately determined by a mix of geography and genes, with less and less emphasis on the former as man learns to pay more attention to the latter.

Contemporary theories of history have become so tainted with equalitarianism and environmentalism that open-minded research into the causes and origins of civilization has been partially suspended. What modern historians, most of whom hardly deserve the title even as a courtesy, are mainly concerned about is the justification and proof of their pet theories. They jump at some particular event or series of events to demonstrate that Marx, Freud or Marcuse were right, hardly giving a passing thought to the biological sources of history. Even Toynbee and Spengler, the two most important 20th-century historians, are more content to schematize the ups and downs of cultures and civilizations than to focus on the genetic factors, without which there would be no history at all.

Not for the first time history has reached the point where a clever historian can manipulate it to prove almost anything. The rule appears to be that those who wish to take charge of a state must first take charge of its history. Instead of learning about the past, we are fed historicism, a mischievous mishmash of unfounded theory, irresponsible flights of fancy and addictive reductionism, as our professors sordidly angle for academic honors and rewards. How complex, how argumentative, how hyperarticulated can a field of learning get before it sinks out of sight in a quagmire of incredulity and ridicule!

Historians must acknowledge that environment has preceded man, is always with him, and will of course outlast him. After the environment comes man himself, who makes an artificial environment, which modifies and often conflicts with what nature has wrought.

Imagine a pendulum, not the ordinary type that swings back and forth in a vertical plane, but a Foucault Pendulum that circles around a fixed point. In our nature-nurture model the fixed point moves and the pendulum follows. The movement is not meant to show progression or retrogression in any historical sense. No value judgments, please. The metaphor is intended to illustrate the movement of historic cycles, which is

more than mere chronology and the repetition of events. The fact is, events never repeat. They only give the illusion of repetition. What our metaphoric pendulum attempts to demonstrate is that history has its cycles, but never the same cycles. In saying this we are contradicting some famous sages of history, who tell us we must learn from recurring patterns. The point is, we should not be interested in patterns or theories of history. We should be interested in history.

The triune model—natural environment, man, artificial environment—is not quite as simple as its circular form appears. The earth has a range of environments which work on man in different ways and to which he responds in different ways. Since there are different kinds of men, there will be different responses to the same environment.

A certain set of circumstances influences or forces a certain group of men to act or live in a certain way. These same circumstances might induce a different group of men to act or react in a sharply different manner. Just as individuals differ widely in disposition and temperament, so do groups. Group behavior is strongly influenced by leaders of the groups, by those whose temperament and predispositions (instincts) are magnifications of the average temperament and predispositions of the group at large.

A time factor must also be considered. A young race or a new race that emerges on the world scene will behave, act and react differently than an old race, one that has been around for millennia and whose behavior and attitudes have been frozen by habit or softened and diluted by easy living, sexual permissiveness, cynicism and general decadence. Such factors will change the character of groups as much as they change the character of individuals.

Environment created man, whose instincts and intelligence drove him to modify it to the point where much of it is now the work of man. Accordingly, historical progress should be explained as the modification of the environment by human means. This is the same as saying that people who for good or evil don't affect the environment don't make history. To have a serious go at history, we should study the environment at any

particular time and place, after first learning as much as we can about the genetic constitution of the people who have both influenced and been influenced by the environment. Once on top of this information, we have a recipe for solid historical study—one that needs no recourse to any such vague theoretical constructs as dialectical materialism, challenge and response or eternal return. These omissions will help, not hinder, us if we wish to unearth the past *as it really was.*

In mentioning the traveling Foucault Pendulum, nothing was said about what makes it travel. It travels because of the human adaptations that are constantly changing the environment. Call it history's *primum mobile.* Here again it is appropriate to point out that change does not always mean progress. It can mean the opposite. We can only come to a fixed conclusion about what happened (history) when we study the inner actions of man, the man-made environment and the natural environment on a case-by-case basis. Only by a thorough knowledge of its parts can we obtain an accurate picture of the historical whole.

Induction has lifted some imaginative people to high levels of problem solving. History, however, is a case where induction should be given short shrift. Putting aside all theorizing, we should collect facts as lovingly and carefully as the old-time prospectors in California sifted through streambeds for gold. Only then will historians strike it rich and their favorite discipline become, if not a science, then a discipline with a scientific footing.

In reflecting on history it should be kept in mind that we are likely to become lost in a labyrinth of error and confusion if we lend too much credence to what is cavalierly called the "historical evidence," most of which is often pure surmise. We have only to note the falsifications of the contemporary media to realize how little of what we read, see or hear about daily events has any relation to the truth. If newsmen can't get the facts straight about what happened yesterday before their very eyes, how can we believe what historians write about events that occurred a thousand years or more before they were born? We can still see the Acropolis, but we can't see Socrates. More

importantly, we can't ask him if the contradictory things Plato and Xenophon wrote about him were even an approximation of the truth. We can probably come as close to the historical truth by extrapolating from our own experiences as we can by leafing through ponderous tomes by dead historians or digesting tendentious theses by those who are still alive and still busy promoting some discredited ideology.

Oswald Spengler, the doom-and-gloom historian, was partly right. Cultures and civilizations *are* organic and pass through cycles of birth, growth, maturity and death. But the German philosopher of history neglected to add, perhaps so as not to put his scholarly respectability at risk, that races are even more organic than cultures and civilizations. More than any other factor, their appearance and disappearance, their efflorescence and decay, are the real stuff of history.

Spengler linked various stages of culture and civilization with the seasons. His organic timetables should, but unfortunately did not, stimulate research into the racial components of his cultures. Broadening Spengler's cycles into racial cycles would deepen the study of the past and help remove a great deal of the guesswork responsible for the promulgation of so many wild—and in the case of Marxism—violence-provoking and envy-ridden theories of history.

Nations are only part of the human story, hopefully an ever diminishing part. From nations arise the multiracial enormities known as empires, which, after alternating periods of affluence and poverty, after stunning military victories and disastrous defeats, exhaust the energies of the original culture bearers, who then revert to the barbarous condition from which they originally emerged. In modified Spenglerian terms, a race is the springtime, a nation is the summer, an empire is the autumn and the return to barbarism is the winter. First on the scene is a hunting band, then a tribe, then the beginnings of a homogeneous state or nation. Prosperous and successful homogeneous nations inevitably attract immigrants of other races which proceed to make the population heterogeneous. In the process the stage is set for a polyglot empire, which holds together only as long as the military or ruling party is strong enough to control

internal ethnic hostilities and powerful enough to ward off foreign enemies. One of the implicit goals of the ethnostate is precisely to stop this Spenglerian cycle dead in its tracks, to let it go no further than its springtime. Huge, unwieldy, heterogeneous nations and empires cannot emerge from small homogeneous states, if the first duty of the state is to prohibit the genetic dilution of its population.

Summer cannot follow spring and winter autumn, if there are no seasons. Spengler may have discovered some order in history, but there is no reason to buy the deterministic and pessimistic line that history must repeat—and repeat—and repeat. In point of fact, the autumn of a culture usually starts to set in shortly after the end of its springtime. Despite the so-called power and glory of the British Empire, England was never so great as when Shakespeare's dazzling pen was active and Newton was mathematizing gravity. America, a superpower for most of the late 20th century, was never so great as when the Founding Fathers were turning political science into high art.

Races taking root in the seedbeds of their particular environments create the cultures which evolve into what we call civilizations. When races expire, their cultural creations founder. A state may survive its creators, but only in a perverted and distorted form. Races set the time and spatial boundaries of cultures. The rise and fall of a race can encompass the birth and death of several cultures created by that race in different environments and in different eras.

Whereas a tribal community, the embryo of a state, might have a life span of only a few hundred years, the state itself, although undergoing radical transformations in government and territory, may endure for ten or more centuries. Races live much longer. The Nordic, Alpine and Mediterranean subraces are still extant and have been since recorded history. The same may be said about the Negroid and Mongoloid races. But where are the Cro-Magnons? When the racial memory is lost, the race as a dynamic, historical force, is also lost.

If a state perishes, the damage is not necessarily irreparable. The founding race may still be around, still fertile enough to

engender other states and other cultures and civilizations. States and cultures that emerge from the genetic substrate of the same race, even though far removed in time and space, are apt to have many common characteristics.

History Defined. A country's greatness does not depend on the wars it has won, the wealth it has produced or the territory it has grabbed. A country's greatness is determined by the genius of its people and by applying that genius to unique achievements in the arts, sciences and government.

History is not the biography of nations, as some prefer to define it. To say that the United States was born in 1776, went through internal convulsions in the Civil War, became the leading world power for most of the 20th century and then entered a precipitous decline is to calendar a few salient facts and dates, but tells next to nothing about the composition of its people, their habits and their attitudes.

The United States, unlike most large nations, underwent a series of significant racial alterations in the last two centuries. What started out as a constellation of overwhelmingly British colonies was modified in the mid-19th century by Irish and Germans, then heavily infiltrated by Eastern Europeans and Jews at the turn of the century and by Hispanics and East Asians after 1965. Historians may still use the "United States" as a verbal shortcut, but the United States of the late 18th century bears very little demographic resemblance to the United States of today.

To understand what has happened to America or to any other state over any period of time it is first necessary to take note of its people. The history of the U.S. is first a history of the British founders, second a history of the population mix that turned the British racial core into a minority. A state that was composed of one people cannot remain the same when several other peoples are added to the demographic pot. History gets confused when populations get confused. As long as one people keeps its identity and remains the dominant majority or dominant population group of a state, it is possible to write a meaningful history of the state. That is why history

will be more truthful and reliable in a world of ethnostates, where authentic histories can be written about authentic peoples. It is relatively easy to write the history of a single people; it is almost impossible to write the histories of several peoples and combine them into one historic whole.

The history of an ethnostate will be the history of one people in one chronological and one geographical frame. Histories of multiracial states and empires are necessarily scattershot because historians must deal with a kaleidoscope of geographical, environmental and demographic data.

Consider the form of government known as democracy. How and why did it only arise in states scattered thousands of miles apart and separated by thousands of years? What, if any, is the unifying factor? It was that the citizens of Athens had roughly the same genetic components as the Icelanders, the writers of the Magna Carta and the signers of the Declaration of Independence. How similar are the ideas, the artistic drives and the political motivations of these different peoples! On the other hand, what could be more dissimilar than their chronology and their environmental challenges? Yet of all the world's peoples they were the first to make self-government a cornerstone of politics.

Young states have but one history. As states age and indulge in pluralism they accumulate several histories, the separate histories of the several population groups. Over time the chances are that one or more of these groups will become envious of the ruling majority or core group and attempt to oust it from power either by violence or indirectly by maintaining a much higher birthrate. It then becomes customary for historians to trace the development of the state's institutions without taking too much notice of the people who developed the institutions. Eventually each population group's separate history becomes a tool for boosting group self-esteem and a weapon for lowering the self-esteem of rival groups. Sooner or later, history is reduced to a rhetorical accommodation to ethnicity.

To obtain a better understanding of history, E.O. Wilson, the father of sociobiology, proposed a new discipline, "deep history," which would trace man's development from the first

appearance of *Homo sapiens*. This kind of history would include clues about the origin of races and subraces, which in turn would indicate how the people who formed hunting bands, tribes and later nations were themselves formed.

The Western historical establishment, wary of any theory of history that touches on biology, tends to look with special disfavor upon any manifestation of ethnicity on the part of majorities. Minorities are forgiven and often encouraged to be as race-minded as they wish, while majority ethnocentrism is condemned out of hand. Hitler's Germany served as a major justification for this all-pervasive hostility towards white race consciousness. The theme, when hammered home by white liberal historians, often seems to come close to a majority death wish.

Polyethnicity, as expressed by William H. McNeill, the widely acclaimed professor of history at the University of Chicago, has become the latest mania of the historical establishment. Although the implanting of several different races and subraces within the boundaries of one country is admittedly destabilizing and a prime cause of internal strife, the homogeneous alternative is considered even worse.

To support this latter thesis, McNeill and his school downsize the high cultural peaks reached in homogeneous states, assuming that even in their greatest days the population was riddled with minorities—slaves, imported laborers and tillers of the soil, merchants, missionaries preaching exotic religions, foreign intellectuals, aliens of every hue and color—without whose assistance the state would have stagnated. This school of history even goes so far as to assert that the tensions provoked by the presence of heterogeneous racial groups actually help to raise the level of artistic output.

By and large the history of the West has consisted of the history of white majorities. Only in this century have white and (later) nonwhite minorities assumed a measure of power in Western countries. In the United States minority political and economic clout has reached the stage where more and more history is becoming minority history and is being taught as such in leading American universities.

A major aid to the understanding of the history of heterogeneous states is parasitology, a relatively new science that should be studied carefully by all historians. Animal parasitology is already an established scientific discipline, complete with texts and courses in medical colleges. What is lacking so far—and perhaps for understandable reasons—is the study known as human parasitology.

At the human level, parasitology is not simply men and women living off other men and women in the usual parasitic model. Beyond feeding off human bodies, it includes feeding off human minds, a form of parasitism which, for lack of a better word, might be called psychovorism. As minds grow softer in decadent times—and these are very decadent times—they become less resistant to psychovores.

Chapter 13

Less Law, More Justice

The laws of ethnostates should be attuned to the physical and mental traits of its inhabitants. Whether written or unwritten, the constitution should be organic, meaning that it should have the authority to preserve the status quo while inspiriting adventurous minds to go beyond it. Genes sow the seeds of law, which loop back to shape the culture.

The point to stress in any discussion of law is that there can be no human rights without ethnic rights. The most equitable and enforceable statutes are those written not in law books but in the heart and mind. The most inequitable and the most unenforceable laws are those enacted by pandering politicians and interpreted by politically appointed judges. Compare the public's respect for statutory law to its respect for natural law.

The greater the diversity of a population, the more abstract the laws. The more abstract the laws, the easier they are to enact and the harder they are to enforce. Law emanates from custom. A multiracial state has many customs and consequently many laws—so many that law digests and commentaries can fill a sizable library. Small homogeneous states need fewer laws, since they do not have to take into account the variant customs and habits of different population groups.

There are a multitude of incentives to law-breaking in the human psyche—envy, hatred, greed and vengeance, to name a few, all of which are easily aroused by poverty, the conspicuous consumption of plutocrats and unfair treatment in the

courts. Heterogeneous states have an extra incentive for unlawful behavior—racial animosity. In homogeneous states, the populace being monoracial, racial crime cannot exist. The problem is that few such states are now to be found in the white world. The ethnic mix washed up by waves of legal and illegal immigrants from nonwhite countries, or from white countries whose race and culture differ greatly from the Northern or Northwestern European model, bears a great deal of responsibility for the huge rise in the crime rate in the very nations whose populations not so long ago were known for their respect for law and order.

Remove the ubiquitous racial animosity in multiracial states by removing the racial mélange, and the crime rate would plunge. Half the violent crimes in the United States are committed by blacks, although blacks account for no more than 12-13% of the population. For every violent crime that American whites commit against American blacks, blacks commit eight or nine violent crimes against whites.

In heterogeneous nations the jury system has difficulty functioning properly, even where the average citizen has some appreciation of the law and is able to understand some of the courtroom legalese. Minority members of juries cannot escape feeling that minority defendants are "kin" or at the very least are being unfairly persecuted.

When a minority criminal is brought to trial in a city where demographic and residency considerations demand that the jury be largely composed of people of the same race as the accused, it has frequently come to pass that ethnic sympathies produce a hung jury. In the United States and some other Western countries only one juror need decide that the defendant is being prosecuted for insidious racial reasons to set him free, even though all the other jurors found him guilty, even though he is a professional criminal and even though the evidence of his guilt is overwhelming.

Such travesties of justice are all too common in trials of lawbreaking minority politicians, and minority robbers and muggers. Perhaps the worst effect of this unjust justice is the encouragement it offers a nonwhite criminal to ply his trade

more regularly, knowing that "friends" on the jury will let him off easily. Race, in such a situation, supersedes evidence. Even black judges are under some compulsion to give black defendants a break to avoid being accused of selling out their "brothers."

Judgment by one's peers is supposed to mean judgment by one's equals. People of different biological and environmental backgrounds are not equal, no matter what is written in the latest school textbooks, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution or recent Supreme Court decisions.

It is a self-evident truth that a wise judge can dispense justice more efficiently and more fairly than twelve "good men and true." But in these days of doctrinaire democracy, it is still very difficult to convince people that a jury trial is a bad choice for whites caught up in the criminal justice system. The law in these times is not so much concentrated on justice as it is on minority rights.

A wise, square-shooting judge not only has a better understanding of the law, but his experience on the Bench gives him a better understanding of the evidence and how it should be weighed. Though Solomons are always in short supply, a judge can hand down a fair verdict in one-tenth the time and at one-hundredth the cost of jury trials, an increasing number of which end in mistrials, some for the reasons stated above. In many present-day criminal proceedings the guilt or innocence of the person in the dock often fades into a sort of judicial subplot, as the eyes and ears of judge, jury and courtroom audience focus on the forensic and theatrical jousting of the attorneys, the heroes and villains of the legal drama. It goes without saying that courtroom trials should have nothing to do with theater and everything to do with justice. But the very presence of the jurors, whose duties temporarily make them members of a privileged elite—to the best seats in the house, so to speak—moves a trial into the realm least suited for due process, the realm of the stage.

A juryless trial presided over by a no-nonsense judge banishes drama, or at least soap opera, from the courtroom. If for some inexplicable reason, jurors of average intelligence are

better able to determine a defendant's innocence or guilt than a judge of superior intelligence, who is thoroughly knowledgeable in the law, then juries will render more judicious verdicts in an ethnostate. Vestigial racism will not tip the scales of justice, and jurors will go about their tasks more objectively and less emotionally. Both prosecutors and defense attorneys are well aware that the race of the accused affects the minds of jurors, which is why they do everything they can to see that the racial composition of the jury is favorable to their case. When federal prosecutors want to throw the book at a white defendant, they try him in the District of Columbia, where juries are overwhelmingly black. If the defense attorney's client is white, he moves heaven and earth to change the venue from a large city full of blacks to a small city full of whites.

All this costly legal legerdemain would be stillborn if the racism which clouds the legal process in multiracial nations was eliminated. In an ethnostate, where everyone involved in the legal process—arresting officers, judges, prosecuting and defense attorneys, witnesses and defendants—would belong to the same race, the racial restraints on justice would not exist.

There are many subtle and not so subtle ways that racism affects crime. All too many burglaries and robberies in the United States and, to a lesser extent, in other Western countries now end in the death of the victim, just to satisfy the racial hostility of the armed robber. White police officers have been shot dead when they stop nonwhite drivers for speeding or interrupt a burglary in progress. Black arrestees are occasionally beaten unmercifully by white policemen who are driven up the wall by ghetto barbarians.

Race riots in prisons are common events, as are gang rapes of inmates, usually of whites by nonwhites. White policemen have to be very careful when they arrest minority members to avoid being accused of racism and "police brutality." Such accusations can lead to their dismissal and even land them in jail. White judges often give light sentences or none at all to young white first offenders because placing them in an overcrowded jail with nonwhites could endanger their lives.

Many perversions of justice might be avoided if lawmakers

would realize that different races respond differently to Western laws. One law for all often turns out to be a law for none, because members of different races may have varying ideas as to what constitutes criminal behavior. Rather than try to squeeze all human groups into one legal framework, some parts of which are bound to be accepted by one group and rejected by another, the ethnostate would tailor its laws and law enforcement to the commonly shared behavioral traits of its homogeneous citizens.

When it tries to cater to the customs and instincts of a multitude of different population groups, law loses much of its moral force and fervor, and under such conditions is transformed into a plaything of sharp minds, whose sole purpose, aside from garnering flattering headlines and pocketing huge fees, is to find ways of beating the system, keeping criminals out of jail and cutting corners for financial moguls. Modern law consequently favors those sufficiently rich to hire these agile obfuscators, who are generally people with scant affection for the society in which they prosper so handsomely. Less bound to custom and the moral aspects of law imbedded in custom, lawyers become an occupational caste that floats above the social order, both exploiting and perverting it.

Custom would have a strong foothold in ethnostates, thereby requiring less law and fewer lawyers. What attorneys an ethnostate can afford would be under heavy pressure to give up barratry (persistent incitement of litigation). Since they would not be sidetracked by the ethnic factionalism rampant in multiracial societies, lawyers would have more opportunity to concentrate on the pursuit of justice. The absence of ethnic discord would also allow them to devote their time and talents to upholding and fine-tuning the law instead of turning it into a bag of legal tricks and ploys.

There is also the question of respect. As law descends into a battle of wits—the present trend in the West—the public who watch or read about courtroom skirmishes lose respect for the justice system, a state of mind which when it spreads throughout the population inevitably leads to more crime.

This same loss of respect spills over into constitutional law,

as minorities constantly demand radical changes, not by the prescribed course of amendments or popular referenda, but by frivolous legislation. Courtroom strife then moves into legislatures, as the law becomes hostage to lobbies, media agitation and venal politicians.

In an ecumene of ethnostates some laws and legal procedures would be extended to cover those regional, continental or global issues that extend beyond an ethnostate's boundaries. Such matters as air and sea pollution, aging nuclear plants, overpopulation and other threats to the environment are of supreme concern to every person on earth. Any action of one ethnostate that threatens the health and safety of people elsewhere on the planet must be promptly stopped and corrected by third parties. The right of people of the same race and culture to control their own lives without outside interference must not restrict or limit the power of global, continental or regional bodies to safeguard the environment, on which all living things depend, and stamp out any incipient war the moment the first sparks begin to fly.

Chapter 14

The Media Muddle

Events make news, but news also makes events. Today, before big decisions are made in domestic or foreign affairs, the decision-makers are careful to ask themselves, how will it play in the media? If they believe their agenda will look good in print or on television, they will probably go ahead. If it does not, they may not.

Raised on a diet of pseudo-history, the ordinary layman has little difficulty swallowing the media's interpretations of current events—interpretations motivated by the knowledge that to get his report in print or on television, the contemporary newsman must first prove his membership in the hand-wringing club of rampant egalitarianism. How can we expect enlightenment from those whose every word must *ab initio* conform to a narrow ideology?

In any valid discussion of the media, it is helpful to remember these points:

• *Columnists get many, if not most, of their ideas from other columnists. Columnists and editorial writers want readers to ingest their printed thoughts, not develop thoughts of their own. Simpering acquiescence is preferred to boiling reaction.*

• *The closer a magazine or newspaper approaches the truth, the smaller its circulation.*

• *There is no sorrier hypocrite than the newsman who fudges his "facts" so as not to wound the self-esteem of minorities*

and be accused of insensitivity.

• *The fate reserved by the media for a snake that cannot shed its skin is reserved for the conservative who recants too late.*

• *In multiracial democracies the news business is an hour-by-hour accommodation to the liberal mind-set.*

To borrow a phrase from John Keats, where is the Cave of Quietude in a world that has become clangorous? Radio telescopes are even picking up noise from outer space, which heretofore had been considered as silent as it was cold and dark. Who would have thought that the soundless universe would be so full of cacophony? Will infinity turn out to be as noisy as our finite bedlam?

The Western majorities, the most silent of peoples, are being drowned in raucous criticism and disparagement. When a few courageous members of these majorities are occasionally disposed to raise their voices and demur, they are quickly outshouted. It is understandable that decibels should multiply in times of war or catastrophe. But even when peace manages to reign, the noise level in the West is insufferable, especially to ears that have become oversensitized to shrillness by centuries of vocal restraint.

We must learn to filter noise through our consciousness in such a way that we hear the sense of what is being said without the pejorative trimmings, much as encrypted television signals destined for home satellite receivers have to be descrambled before we see the picture. We must somehow build an inner audio and video receiver that immediately recognizes and automatically tunes out false news. A first step is to amplify our skepticism. Nothing that emanates from a columnist, an editorial writer or a reporter should ever be taken for granted. What is omitted from press reports and television news should be noted just as carefully as what is printed or broadcast.

The most effective and painless way to depropagandize the media is to make it a serious crime for any organization, pressure group or individual to attempt to distort the news by threats of political or financial retaliation. The murder of truth

is as heinous a crime as homicide. The ethnostate would have no Anti-Defamation League or NAACP to shape news reporting, because there will be no racial minorities and hence no racial lobbies. Anti-majority message films would disappear from television and movie houses, not only because minority producers, directors and writers would disappear, but also because minority critics would no longer be around to puff up the work of their racial cousins. Most important, the ostracism of books expressing majority viewpoints would end, for the minority agitproppers would have moved to their own ethnostates where, without the racially inspired barbs, their agitating would stir few hearts and minds, and where, to their distress and discomfort, there would be no population group to pick on but their own.

Public opinion is publicized opinion, not the opinion of the public. Public policy is not the policy of the public, but of powerful and affluent lobbies, corporations and politicians. The principal goal of media reform should be to localize—and deepen—news. Canned press reports glorifying the American lifestyle are now being broadcast daily to more than one hundred countries, where they are translated into native languages and rebroadcast to people in the most distant hamlets. The effect on the world's surviving cultures is deadly. To get everyone thinking alike about the news is devastating to cultural growth and independence. The media spin on events assumes much more importance than the events themselves. Hollywood becomes every earthling's capital, and the West's most banal urban conglomeration, Los Angeles, becomes everyone's "Our Town." The once highly articulated cultures of the West become the daily prey of liberal, minority and homosexual scavengers whose cloacal and lascivious activities would shock and outrage the denizens of Sodom and Gomorrah.

The media in an ethnostate would be the voice of the people, the authentic *vox populi.* Men and women of similar race and culture would have access to TV programs designed for them, not their critics. The days of minority pressure would be over because the "pressurizers" would no longer have a majority to pressure. Racism needs "the other" to exist. When there is

no "other," there is no racism.

The reference here is to domestic racism, not the kind that extends across frontiers. The latter racism will probably always be with us. But domestic racism is as dangerous as racism directed abroad, since it leads not only to massacres and wanton mayhem, but to unstable governments and the lowest form of political pandering. The absence of home-grown racism frees up people to spend their time in constructive pursuits, not wasting precious moments sounding off against minorities and looking at every event through race-tinted glasses. To reduce the argument to a sentence: Monoracial countries are less likely than multiracial countries to be permeated with racism.

Chapter 15

The Religious Gene

Now that God is dead or, what amounts to the same thing, has come to be ignored, it may be time to outgrow him. When the movers and shakers of the country turn from the other-worldly to the worldly and concentrate their worship on men, even the worst of men, it is fair to say that religion has reached a low ebb. Some of this cooling off of faith can be blamed on our old gods, who were not too godly. One of our most popular divinities was nailed to a cross beside two thieves. Another took pleasure in killing all the first-born in what was then the world's most highly advanced civilization. Another promised an afterlife enlivened by eternal sex. None of these deities serves as a satisfactory role model for a sinful mankind desperately in need of uplifting.

The religion of the future, if there is to be a serious religious revival, will probably move away from anthropomorphism, from Jehovah, Christ, Mohammed and such newfangled messiahs as Marx, Lenin, Gandhi, Chairman Mao, Martin Luther King Jr. and Nelson Mandela, to a poetic worship of the mystery of Being. Do we really need spurious miracles or miracle workers to stimulate our religious impulses? The miracle of existence is more than sufficient.

Any life form, down to the simplest bacillus, should be enough to satisfy all our inborn metaphysical cravings. Let our future theology focus on the wonders in us and around us, not on the wonders far removed from us. Some may choose Martin Heidegger, the atheist who made Being into a god, to

be their John the Baptist. Others may want no assistance or company as they brood about the unanswerable, the incredible and the inexplicable.

Religion has both united and divided mankind. The higher religions, though noted for teaching morality and altruism, have all too frequently been the cause of devastating wars, both between and within nations. A homogeneous state with a state religion is likely to have more internal stability than a multiracial state with several religions, if only because religious unity offers less opportunity for denominational hostility and bickering.

The ethnostate would lay the groundwork for a coherent social order by basing statehood firmly on race and culture, with the clear understanding that religion is a component of culture. Whenever two or more religious groups are striving for domination in a state, the creation of two or more ethnostates should be considered.

The universal religion which welcomes everyone to its bosom, regardless of race and culture, should be strenuously opposed by biological arguments for the evolutionary advantages of separatism. As ethnostates become firmly established, as population controls take effect and the average intelligence of the citizenry is raised, the religious proselytizing that has so often led to the destruction of native cultures should diminish. Both religious and irreligious ethnostates would be able to live side by side in harmony if over-the-border proselytizing is forbidden and if the religion of one state and the irreligion of another truly reflect the feelings and aspirations of its believers or nonbelievers.

It might even come to pass, in view of the favorable conditions provided by ethnostates for the improvement of human understanding, that organized religions will fade into limbo, leaving only the legacy of their moral codes. Eventually men and women may achieve such mental growth that they will no longer have to be frightened or coaxed into behaving morally by clergymen preaching damnation from pulpits or whispering dubious advice in confessionals.

Chance and necessity are not necessarily enemies of reli-

gion. Indeed, there was a god of chance in the Greek pantheon. As for polytheism, we should not shrug off Gustave Le Bon's apothegm that stupid people are the most devout monotheists. Is a god of probability or a god of necessity too far removed from a god of science? Why should not nature, the oldest divinity, and technology, the newest, rule heaven and earth hand-in-hand?

Religion short-circuits the aggressive instinct of man with stirring pleas for altruism and mercy. Unselfishness is certainly a useful trait when the time comes to bring order to barbarism. But when civilization grows old, altruism may open the door to barbarism of another type, the type associated with decadence. The barbarism of the undercivilized and the barbarism of the overcivilized are equally destructive. The difference is that the barbarism of the undercivilized can be viewed as a correctable youthful defect, since youngsters are more susceptible to education than oldsters. The barbarism of the overcivilized, on the other hand, is a sign of approaching death, from which recuperation is nigh impossible.

One of the hardest, if not the hardest, task for any reformer, revolutionary or race preservationist is to overturn a mass religion. Except in those rare moments in history when one religion succeeds another, the most that can be done is to nibble around the edges of a prevailing faith and nudge it in a different direction.

Most practicing and believing Christians can be persuaded to support political and social reforms that impose or reimpose moral standards that come out strongly against pornography, sexual promiscuity and the breakdown of the criminal justice system. But when the focus is on genetics, Christians have been known to waffle.

To an ethnostatist, the positive and progressive elements of Christianity are often canceled out by the negative reactionary elements. Accordingly, Christians cannot be counted on to be of any great help to ethnostate advocates. Any activist who introduces the Christian religion or any other religion in an ethnostate movement must be sure he has adequate support from the faithful.

If it should become necessary to defend the ethnostate concept against the attacks of Christian clerics, they should not be characterized as Christians but simply as critics. Whatever the turn of events, every effort should be made not to stir up the hornet's nest of religious politics.

History furnishes few examples of different races worshipping different gods existing side by side in a peaceful, prosperous and unified social order. States that are the arena of several religions only seem to have a degree of stability when one religion is dominant. So-called universal religions have transcended racial and political boundaries but not always peacefully. Christianity in its various forms has been adopted at one time or another by several of the earth's races. Islam, expanding well beyond its Arabic roots, made large inroads in Central Asia, Indonesia and black Africa. Buddhism, born in India, penetrated deeply into China, Japan and other parts of Eastern and Southeast Asia.

Although it has a nice resonance, there is something misleading about the term "universal religion." Examined more closely, Christianity is not as universal as it first appears. Roman Catholics, many Protestant denominations, Eastern Orthodox, Christian Scientists, Mormons and Seventh Day Adventists do not really worship at the same altar. The most they have in common is a vague emotional allegiance to Jesus Christ and varying beliefs and disbeliefs in disjointed parts of the Bible.

Ultimately, many of the special characteristics and teachings of a religion, universal or parochial, can be traced directly to race. Christianity is still a white-dominated faith, despite its large and growing number of nonwhite communicants. The major denominations that compose Christianity have different racial backgrounds. Roman Catholicism was the religion of the West when it was presided over by Nordic feudal lords. When the power of this aristocracy waned in Southern Europe, the Church was divided and Protestantism took over in the North. Some anthropologists have pointed out that the boundary between Catholic and Protestant Europe often approximates the racial boundary between Nordics on the one side and Alpines

and Mediterraneans on the other.

The larger the state and the more numerous the population, the greater the probability of religious divisiveness. A homogeneous population is one effective means of eliminating this nettle of intramural religious disputes from the body politic. The original demographic nucleus for every religion was obviously one race. As time passes and the faith spreads beyond its native borders, it cannot escape assuming some of the characteristics and dispositions of the converted aliens. Consequently, a universal religion soon breaks down into a patchwork of religious denominations that have less and less in common. Unitarianism and Catholicism, though they both carry the label of Christianity, differ from each other in matters of theology and ritual as greatly as the two denominations differ from an Islamic or Buddhist sect.

Racial and cultural values eventually modify and remodel an imposed religion, though the time lag varies. As the racial composition of a country changes over the centuries, its religion will be diverted into new, often esoteric channels. Religious mavericks and revolutionaries have learned from experience that attacks on religion have the habit of getting out of hand and changing into all-out assaults on the long-established manners and mores of the people at large.

Every race or subrace which adopts a universal religion, either willingly or by force, or by a combination of the two, eventually puts its own imprint on it. Just as different genes are responsible for different physical traits, they are also responsible for different mental traits, tastes, predispositions, emotional reactions and all the other instinct-based activity of man. It follows that not all races will have the same attitudes towards "eternal life." A spiritual consensus is much more likely to be achieved by one race than by several.

Ethnostatists should treat the social gospel of Jesus with great caution. Past events have proved that under certain circumstances Christianity can easily become an altruistic Trojan Horse. It invites outsiders, no matter what their physical and mental qualifications, to migrate in waves to countries where, with a judicious amount of racial and minority networking,

they are able to accumulate sufficient wealth and political power to subvert the social order established by the host population.

Today, we see Christian ministers and priests actively assisting illegal aliens from Mexico and other Central American countries to cross the southern border of the United States and go about "Hispanicizing" vast areas of Texas and California. Christianity, under the direction of dedicated churchmen, has given a religious stamp of approval to undermining America's racial foundation. A somewhat similar situation exists in Western Europe, where legal and illegal immigration has become a major political, economic and social issue.

The Disputatious Divines. It is unfortunate that humans cannot rely solely on their instincts and abilities to establish and uphold the moral standards that make civilized life possible. Sadly, throughout the ages, most human beings have required a religion promising eternal bliss or eternal hellfire to keep them in line, though their priests and parsons have been known to cross the line.

Attempting to increase their power and riches and establish their ecclesiastical primacy, religious potentates have practiced Machiavellian diplomacy, fomented rebellions and started wars as cruel and destructive as wars of conquest.

Domestic religious conflicts are especially brutal, as those who lived in the times of Cromwell and Luther learned to their sorrow. Though aggression is a well-known, perhaps necessary, human trait, religious aggression often extends well beyond the outer limits of permissible social behavior. All too many of history's "greats" have been more interested in capturing men's souls than in capturing their bodies.

Separation of church and state has been one means of dampening religious aggression. If evangelists and missionaries are warned in advance that it is unlawful to meddle in politics and force their theology down the throats of the unconvinced and unconverted, they are more likely to confine their activities to matters of direct concern to their own church.

Religious disputations create distrust, hatred and even des-

pair among believers and nonbelievers. It defies common sense to force people of a puritanical bent to live side by side with members of a church that has lesbian ministers. Integration of this kind, call it religious integration, never really integrates. All it does is increase tensions and multiply occasions for violence. If two or more standards of morality are promoted in the same state, it makes it more difficult for the ordinary mortal to tell right from wrong.

People in the modern world are faced with too many problems as it is. They do not need to experience the moral and physical turmoil associated with living in a multireligious state and being thrown into a welter of competing religions, each representing and preaching differing sets of moral standards. No matter how unappealing it may be to modern religionists, an ethnostate would be free of clergymen debating who is on the right track to heaven.

Whatever we think about religion, it is going to be around until human beings move much further up the evolutionary scale. It has a pertinacity, even in those officially atheistic Communist states which deified their leaders and imposed a highly ramified Marxist theology on the masses.

Until men and women arrive at the stage where they understand that moral standards derive from the head and the heart, not from "on high," it should be the state's job to see that the moral aspects of religion are treated with respectful deference. It will be much easier to accomplish this in a state not divided into hostile population groups. Race is a binding force. Culture is a binding force. Religion, when it is not fragmenting into a lot of squabbling sects, can be a binding force.

Morality from Science. The time has come for Westerners to stop partitioning science and morality. Moral predispositions have developed into rules and systems of behavior that have survival value for groups as well as individuals. Perhaps the popularity of religion among all races can be explained by man's subconscious recognition of the importance of morality and the importance of religion in institutionalizing morality.

The British-born psychologist Raymond Cattell believes that

man, or at least civilized man, has progressed to where science can supplant religion as the primary source of morality. Religion, he asserts, carries a lot of unsavory baggage—crank theories, immoral history, corrupt leadership, deviate churchmen. Science, largely free of such impediments, is far more qualified to address the moral component of man.

Cattell advises churches to stop scaring people into becoming moral and let reason, not fear, convince their congregations that morality is the way to go. But first the social sciences must live up to their name and become true sciences. Then the psychologists and sociologists, instead of acting like priests and gurus, as many still do, can dig deeper into the roots of behavior and come up with research that should put morality on a firm, scientific footing. Rules can then be formulated which will allow the social order to be organized in such a way that much of the crime and misbehavior that has slowed human progress over the centuries will be largely eliminated. Science, by actual tests, will be able to diagnose the morality quotient of humans at the earliest possible age, making it possible to give special attention to the moral weaklings.

Both by setting up rules for moral conduct that are based on vast amounts of behavioral research and by perfecting tests to measure a person's predisposition for sticking to the straight and narrow, social science should emerge from the doldrums and begin to play a crucially important part in forging a better world.

A moral scientist can be relied upon to produce good science. He will not concern himself with developing deadlier forms of poison or more powerful thermonuclear bombs. He will not be morally neutral. He will spend as much time and effort inching science into the domain of morality as he does inching morality into the domain of science.

Does religion in the West have a future? It is reasonable to suppose it will slowly lose some of its popularity as the mysteries of nature, which used to fill people with religious awe, become less mysterious, owing to the quantum leaps of science. As for the moral component of religion, it too may become less important when the day comes that a geneticist may be

able to engineer or breed morality by removing or adding specific genes to the female egg or male sperm before conception. Multiracial states would be much more reluctant than ethnostates to undertake such earth-shaking research, which would almost certainly be denounced as "racist" by the thought police.

Morality vs. Immorality. One problem with obscenity is the difficulty of pinpointing it. What is obscene to some is perfectly acceptable to others. What offends a woman may not bother a man. Laws against obscenity, which come and go in cycles, vary with time and place. Once the floodgates of obscenity are open, they are hard to close. What occurs, naturally and normally, in a barnyard is obscene in a living room. Barnyard behavior and civilized behavior are at opposite poles. When they begin to converge, it's back to the barnyard.

A few superior men have raised masses of lesser men to almost superhuman levels. But the strain is so great and the downward pull of our animal nature so strong that decline and degeneration quickly set in. From then on it is a march downhill, punctuated by intermittent eras of partial recovery. Measure the amount of obscenity, both sub-rosa and acceptable, at any milestone along this march, and you will have a fair idea of the society's health.

Nearly everyone agrees that children should be protected from obscenity, but many intellectuals of a liberal bent insist that almost no limit should be set on what is seen, heard and read by adults. They reinforce their argument by reminding their critics it takes only minimal effort not to buy or read an "offensive" book, switch off the TV or remove their eyes from erotic or cloacal graffiti. The bitter truth is that huge, salaciously worded newspaper headlines on display in kiosks and sudden off-color intrusions in supposedly innocuous TV programs are visual insults that only the blind can avoid.

One commonly proposed way to regulate obscenity is to apply what are called community standards. But in a multiracial state there are several communities; hence several standards. When it is a matter of defining the parameters of

obscenity, a better and fairer job can be done by those who share a common culture than by a potpourri of heterogeneous groups, which are sure to have contradictory opinions of what does and what does not "go too far."

The most troubling thing about obscenity is its power to coarsen young minds. The adolescent who views the animalistic cavortings in X-rated films may never have the same opinion of men and women again. He may never be able to believe in Beatrice, if he should read Dante, or relish the prim literary masterpieces of Jane Austen. He has seen men and women acting like beasts. Once shattered, his Panglossian view of his fellow human beings may never be recaptured.

Quite possibly the coarsening effect of obscenity gives an animalistic twist to the human psyche. If it does, then it follows that unlimited freedom of expression may have actually lowered the wattage of the idealism that over millennia has given a radiant glow to human thought.

Obscenity is not a black eye that clears up with time. It is a permanent wound. Some may be nonchalant when exposed to it. So-called tough hombres may brush it off. But it leaves a lasting stain. Lurid exhibitions of every form of physical contact between members of the opposite sex, between members of the same sex, between old men and young boys—sexual encounters often spiced with sadism and masochism—have a sharp impact on human sensitivities. The artistic tastes of men and women assaulted by daily or weekly exhibitions of hardcore eroticism cannot help but be corroded. Persons fed highly seasoned food over a period of time find it hard to return to a bland diet. The widespread availability of pornographic films, literature and art tends to make them habit-forming. As we move back or are moved back closer to the ape, the fragile cocoon of civilization may come completely undone. Barely suppressed demons are always ready to fly out of the Pandora's Box buried in every human being.

By setting high standards of conduct and morality and by outlawing most manifestations of obscenity, high civilizations can delay the moral degeneration that inevitably sets in when the tastemakers let down their guard. As the laws against ob-

scenity fall in abeyance, there will always be some individuals who will push them to their farthest limits, just as the drug addict continually increases his dose to obtain his "high."

Different races and cultures have different tolerances for obscenity. In a multiracial society, one or more population groups may indulge in what members of other population groups would consider impermissible behavior. Much of black rap is judged obscene by whites fearful of the outright calls for rape and murder contained in some of the doggerel. Some religious denominations tend to be more straitlaced than others. These varying interpretations of obscenity have produced severe and lasting disagreements, even armed confrontations, throughout human history.

Different ideas about obscenity have been known to exacerbate class and religious conflicts. The Puritans against the Stuart monarchs in the British Isles and the peasant revolts in medieval Europe are two examples. Obscenity was a burning issue in such conflicts because the rich had the means and the leisure to act more lasciviously and scandalously than the poor, whose dawn-to-dusk labor left little time for philandering, though much time for envy.

Obscenity, as might be expected, reaches lower depths in multiracial societies than in homogeneous ones. The contrast between the sexual mores of the early Roman Republic and the late Roman Empire offers a clear picture of the animalism that sets in as a society loses its racial core. Compare the moral standards of the United States in the last century to those in the last half of the 20th. The radical decline in moral behavior was highly correlated with the decline in the number and proportion of the British-descended population and the increasing presence and influence of minorities.

An ethnostate would help curb obscenity, for the simple reason that its moral standards would be those of one population group, not several. It is a far easier task to regulate the conduct of a monoracial than a multiracial society.

The Greeks had a word for pornography and devoted much attention to the subject, as have all higher civilizations. What

varies over the ages is its quantity and availability. Those few who could afford to visit the *bagnios* of Shanghai at the turn of the century were able to find as much smut as the masses could find in the "everything goes" Weimar Republic of the 1920s. In the 1980s we could switch to an "adult" channel on cable TV or drive a half-mile or so to the nearest "adult" bookstore to rent or buy a videotape that would make a decadent Roman salivate. Today, pornography is everywhere. Yesterday, it was harder to find, but it was always there.

The current pattern of instant availability applies not just to pornography but to practically all manifestations of the new permissiveness. Drugs in Western countries used to be the vice of the rich. Now large numbers of addicts can be found in the middle and lower classes, including the criminal underclass.

The cliché that any amount of lubricity is acceptable provided it is presented or accomplished artistically does not hold water. When pornography shows up in some form of entertainment or "art" that supposedly has, as the Supreme Court would say, some redeeming social value, the persons exposed to it forget all about the "art" and focus exclusively on the scatological content.

The degree of pornography's penetration into the collective conscience is a bellwether of decline. The youthful period of a culture generally allows no more than sporadic doses of healthy bawdiness. Perversion is scorned and perverts ridiculed. Signs of cultural aging are apparent in the transformation of poetic drama into prurient mimes, the fate of the theater in Rome. Today, in spite of the dialogue that seems to demand a prescribed number of four-letter words, films and television dramas are hardly more than mimes, with their obligatory nudity and bedroom gambols.

Pornography can never be totally eliminated, sex being the underpinning of all mammalian existence. But history demonstrates time and again that pornography can be contained and controlled, and many of its bad effects avoided, by keeping it out of easy reach. If it is costly, confined to special areas, and obscenity laws are enacted and enforced, it will find a much smaller audience.

A small homogeneous state is better able to control pornography than a large heterogeneous state with larger areas to monitor and a diverse citizenry that cannot agree on the boundaries of obscenity. Peer pressure, which would abound in ethnostates, is a very effective deterrent to aberrant social behavior.

The wave of pornography now flooding the West is only possible because the laws that legalize it and the permissiveness that feeds it have overridden Western cultural restraints and exposed hundreds of millions to the mind-rotting effects of obsessive sexuality. Perhaps obscenity can be best defined as a catalyst of social deterioration.

The Moral Schism. Most of us subscribe to two ethical systems: one for "us" and one for "them." The "us" can be as few as the members of a family or as many as the population of an entire country. War generally makes the "us" larger in number and more closely bound. Peace and prosperity have the opposite effect.

Two or more races have difficulty fitting into an overall "us" picture. Similar language, nationhood and citizenship accentuate the "us," but seldom—or at least not for long—are these factors able to overcome the "them," who belong to a different culture or ethnicity. In a multiracial nation "us" and "them" are omnipresent, despite the integrating pressures of law, language, education and common geography.

Social bonds within any society must be based on some element of mutual trust. In the average ethnic group these bonds are usually strong. Behavior that might be allowed, even encouraged, towards outsiders is not tolerated within the group. The long record of human ups and downs advertises the stern lesson that a population group generally has one moral code for itself and another for everyone else.

Cheating is considered a crime when practiced against members of one's own group. It is less of a crime—it can even earn applause—when the person who is cheated is of another race. The same double standard is applied to many other aspects of moral behavior. The culprit who commits a crime within the

group and is fiercely punished may be honored for doing the same to a "foreigner." Morality has hard going when it is cynically manipulated by those who do to outsiders what they would not do to each other.

In a pluralistic state there is a constant struggle among the various population groups for more political power, not only to get their merited or unmerited share of the nation's material wealth, but to establish legislative and judicial safeguards against discrimination and second-class citizenship. Such conflicts and confrontations are usually exacerbated by appeals to race.

Freed from troublesome and divisive racial differences by its homogeneity, the ethnostate is able to bypass the social, political and economic fractionalization that is aided and abetted by ethnic clashes. Since every bomb must be detonated by a fuse, if the fuse (multiracialism) is absent, the bomb (racial strife) won't detonate. The double standards arising from the ethics of "us" and "them" are inoperative in an ethnostate.

The majority moralist is in a quandary in a multiracial scenario. His conscience prods him to argue for what amounts to the devaluation or dilution of his own culture in order to provide more opportunities for a better and fuller life for the less fortunate. He is not even sure that the objects of his concern will profit from the help he wants to offer them, no matter how frequently, unselfishly and bounteously such help is offered. Yet he insists on expanding his altruism to lengths which may eventually cause a sharp deterioration in the character of the very people he is trying to help. Population groups fare best when they draw their strength from within. When people of one culture meddle in the culture of another, the ensuing hybridization may erase some of the most valuable elements of both cultures and accentuate some of the worst.

If we have to choose between truth and morality—they are not the same—it is generally easier to choose the latter, especially if we are prepared to coat it with a thick gloss of sticky sentimentality. "Truth," wrote Martin Luther in his darkest mood, "goes a-begging," while Shakespeare assures us that eventually it "will come to life." The Bard is on target.

Sooner or later, truth will catch up to those who try to conceal it by donning a Mambrino's helmet of morality.

Truth informs us about the innate differences in population groups, that all such groups are to some degree biologically typecast. But when one segment of a country's population knows its deficiencies and another segment is aware of its genetic perks, the ensuing mix of frustration and arrogance presents a constant danger to the public order. No matter how well the facts of biological diversity are concealed by the egalitarian smoke screen of a universal religion, they will nevertheless manifest themselves again and again in human affairs. We all may be equal in the eyes of God, but only the willfully astigmatic will say we are equal in the eyes of Man.

Given a large boost by Christianity, by the political religion known as liberalism and by the human instinct known as altruism, almost all Western countries since the end of World War II have taken a firm stand against racial discrimination. Laws were passed guaranteeing equal rights, in many cases more than equal rights, to minorities. It was all so "moral" that no one could stand up and oppose the legislation without being shouted down as a bigot.

In the United States after the desegregation of public education had become the law of the land and the Supreme Court had ordered all Americans to be color-blind, the unexpected happened—unexpected, that is, to moralists. When blacks were openly discriminated against, they could blame their failures, their poverty and their low place on the social ladder on white racism. But even after the job and educational roadblocks had been removed by court order and civil rights legislation, most blacks still remained mired in backwardness. Who or what was to blame? Liberal apologists and black politicians advanced the argument that the effect of centuries of discrimination could not be eliminated in a few years. This was a weaker argument than the one attributed to lack of equal opportunity. Though the nurturists would not agree, it introduced a kind of latter-day Lamarckism into the picture—the inheritance of acquired characteristics. The black father and mother, having been the victims of discrimination in slavery times and conse-

quently unable to use the full range of their talents, passed on to their offspring the genes that had been affected by these limitations. Darwin would have passionately disagreed, but Darwinism was superseded in such cases by the nurturism of left-wing social anthropologist Margaret Mead and her mentor, Franz Boas.

If centuries of discrimination had been holding back blacks, then common decency and morality demanded that they be given some form of compensation—such as affirmative action, a program and policy that went well beyond equal opportunity into the realm of special privilege. The black was no longer to be treated as an equal, but as an adult problem child who needed special help to succeed in a world not of his making. In a sense, this was the old Jim Crow argument, without a paternalist government standing by with waivers to allow for the inability of blacks to catch up. But this backhanded concession to genetics was only acknowledged in private by the more intelligent and open-minded members of the integrationist lobby. Publicly they said that after a certain length of time—never specified—blacks, as a result of special treatment and disproportionate attention, would finally be on a real par with other races and be able to make it on their own.

Having seen how little special privileges have done for blacks in the United States, Canada and Britain, one does not have to be a brilliant economist to predict that all projects for black betterment would fail as badly as the misbegotten equal opportunity programs. As the black masses continue to fail to match white performance, they and their advocates will continue to demand more laws, more favors and more special treatment, until quotas, race-based promotions and minority set-asides have been institutionalized throughout most of the West. Ultimately this reverse racism was bound to produce a political backlash. In America, millions of Southern and blue-collar whites deserted the Democratic Party, perceived to be the party of Negroes and Hispanics, while black riots and shooting sprees recruited previously independent voters for the G.O.P., perceived to be the party of law and order. In Britain the criminal behavior of West Indian blacks has strengthened the

political muscle of the Tory right wing. In France violent confrontations of African blacks and North African Moslems with the police have succeeded in making Jean-Marie Le Pen's National Front into Europe's largest, most active and most influential anti-immigration party. Other Western countries, such as Canada, Australia and New Zealand, are only beginning to learn what awaits them if they do not shut the door on the millions of nonwhites clamoring to enjoy the good life they were never able to create for themselves.

When the time comes, as it surely must, that all the legislative and economic measures giving a leg up to blacks are finally stripped away in a tidal wave of reaction or counterrevolution or when, in the worst case, blacks actually assume power in a Western nation, they will soon be back where they started—at the bottom of the economic and social heap. Either whites will drive them out of office, or the nation will be transformed into a Third World basket case. It is even possible that there will be a repeat performance of what blacks did when they took over Haiti nearly two centuries ago and massacred every white man, woman and child they could get their hands on.

The final spreadsheet of affirmative action will show that a half-century or so of vast Western expenditures on racial integration will have gone down the drain. The belief in innate racial differences, at least in regard to the capabilities of blacks, Hispanics and Middle Easterners to establish industrial, high-tech democratic societies, will be engraved more firmly than ever in the consciousness of the average Westerner, who may finally summon up enough courage to speak his mind on this issue and stop it from being monopolized and distorted by an academic and media-wise caste.

In the end, the great 20th-century orgy of false morality and untruth will prove to be one more tragedy (or tragic farce) for the history books. Affirmative action—the British call it positive discrimination—was a mild social palliative in the short term but in the long term embarrassingly and dangerously counterproductive. Creating more problems than it solved, it had the effect of disproving what it set out to prove. Worst of all, it raised false expectations in the hearts and minds of

countless millions of whites and blacks, who later were traumatized by the demoralization that sets in when high hopes are dashed.

The ethnostate is not the enemy of morality. It is the enemy of false morality, in particular the false morality that permeates and attempts to justify equalitarianism. By profiting from the many advantages that come with racial and cultural separatism, the ethnostate should do more than any other form of government to soften the harsh biological facts of racial differences, while in no way denying them.

The black in his own land, whether in the New or Old World, would no longer be in daily personal contact with whites. He would escape most of the competitive struggles that have so constantly thwarted him in white-dominated lands. In a Negro ethnostate the black would be able to think much more about himself and much less about "whitey." He would be free to go his own political, cultural and social way, without whites setting up goals he could never achieve and standards he could never match—and never wanted to match. In his own state, the black would be living and working in an environment in which he, not whites, would make the rules.

There is no better way of alleviating the black's lack of self-respect, no better means of liberating him from the frustration of competing with whites in white societies than to remove him from the interracial interface. The same kind of separatism, with some modifications, is appropriate for other minorities in Western countries and for Asian minorities in the East.

Westerners, although they have often been the architects of racial confrontations, have suffered enough from them. What other political configuration than the ethnostate can provide a more effective framework for ending racial conflicts, the oldest, ugliest, most destructive form of human behavior?

Chapter 16

In Sum. . .

Westerners need to put on a new pair of glasses with which to view the world, knowing full well that for an introductory period new glasses are an uncomfortable fit. Even if the West or a small segment of the West collapses as a result of the multiracialism and multiculturalism imbedded in liberal theology, minority dynamism and the unheroic inertia of majorities, some of the ideas presented in this book may help prevent similar disasters from occurring in a more distant future.

All nations and empires eventually expire, some by conquest and absorption, some by internal fragmentation, some by racial and cultural suicide. If handled wisely, the breakup could be a positive step towards a higher civilization for the heirs.

Wisdom, which is fertilized by liberty, flourishes most brilliantly on a small stage. An ethnostate that restricts its territory and population to manageable proportions can concentrate on the truly important tasks of Western man: how to continue his evolutionary progress while beset by enemies, real and imagined, who want to put an end to him.

It is important for everyone, not just Westerners, that the West does not go under. If it does, the rest of the world may accompany it.

It is possible that the appearance of a higher type of man rests on the survival of Western man. Self-sufficiency, self-determination, and cultural and political autonomy are ideas that, as the song has it, are blowing in the wind. Suppressed population groups are trying to break away from First World

nations and from what remains of the crumbling Second (Marxist) World. The Third World is bursting at the seams with diverse nonwhite governments struggling desperately to give their hungry populations a passable standard of living. The Fourth World, not often described as such, consists almost entirely of tribal peoples who have their own traditional cultures and gene pools, but next to no political and economic infrastructure.

The principal theme of this study has been the need to create what the author has chosen to call ethnostates and to reap the many benefits that would derive therefrom. Among many other advantages, ethnostates would serve as lifeboats to keep whites alive until they recover their spirits and morale and again take their place in the vanguard of the Great Evolutionnary Trek.

When the leading characters are written out of a play, nothing remains but empty dialogue. Should whites, whose suicidal birthrate has declined to well below the replacement level, go under, the Trek might come to a crashing halt.

This racial angle has been completely missed or deliberately ignored by the bioregionalists, devolutionaries and Greens, who focus on saving nature and the non-human environment, but are not at all concerned about the quality and type of people who would inhabit what they have been so ardently trying to save. The ethnostatist thinks first about people, then about the environment, not vice versa. This strange reversal of priorities by the environmentalists has been one reason for this book.

Whites should be saved, not for their own sake but because of their special place in the order of things. In all the innumerable galaxies out there, none may have any life form as advanced as *Homo sapiens*. Because they are that division of *Homo sapiens* most capable of carrying on the Faustian adventure, whites are precious commodities. The Chinese and Japanese may run out of steam in a whiteless world, since the greater part of their science and technology has been cribbed from the West.

The human record certifies that the race that has lifted itself

higher above the ape than any other is the one that has a patent on white genes.

This is where the ethnostate enters the picture. It is perhaps the only peaceful and sensible means of assuring white survival in an increasingly antiwhite, nonwhite world. Withdrawal and reorganization, devolution to ensure evolution would seem to be the most logical and intelligent road to salvation for a people—and possibly a planet—facing extinction.

Appendix

PROBABLE AND IMPROBABLE ETHNOSTATES IN NORTH AMERICA

Cumberland. The territory of Virginia, Kentucky and Tennessee centered around the Cumberland Gap (Daniel Boone country). Population is largely Scots-Irish and English. Statehood would be a first step towards ethnostatehood.

Northern California. If the state were divided in two, the northern part would become the homeland for white Californians (minus white unassimilable minorities). The multiracial, multicultural southern part would be dominated by Hispanics and a mix of other nonwhite minorities.

Aztlán. The American Southwest, under the not-ungentle prodding of Hispanics, would secede from the Union and become an independent Mex-America. (Ironically, this could be interpreted as a latter-day enactment of the 1915 Plan of San Diego by Mexicans, which called for a liberation force of Mexicans, Negroes and Indians to drive the whites out of Texas, California, Arizona, New Mexico and Colorado. Blacks would get Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming, Kansas, Nebraska and South Dakota for their part in the project. Indians would retrieve their lost hunting grounds.)

Nine Nations of North America. See the book of the same title by Joel Garreau (Avon Books, New York, 1981).

New England. The states that comprise present-day New England would declare their independence and establish a separate nation that would contain a sliver of New York state and extend northeast from Maine to include the maritime provinces of eastern Canada.

The Foundry. New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, the upper half of Indiana, Michigan and the west shore of Lake Michigan, starting with Chicago and reaching north to comprise 10% of eastern Wisconsin.

The Breadbasket. The great North American farmlands, stretching as far north as Winnipeg and as far south as Houston and extending east to include a large part of Wisconsin, Illinois and Missouri.

Dixie. From Dallas on the west, eastward through all the southern states, stopping short of southern Florida.

The Islands. The Caribbean Islands, plus the southern tip of Florida.

Mex-America. California's San Joaquin Valley, Los Angeles, Baja California, the northern states of Mexico, the southern half of Arizona, most of New Mexico and a ribbon of Texas from El Paso to the edge of Houston. A modern and more moderate version of the Plan of San Diego.

Ecotopia. The Pacific Coast zone (approximately 100 miles wide) north from San Francisco through Vancouver, Canada, to Anchorage, Alaska.

The Empty Country. The Rocky Mountain states, ranging north through most of central and western Canada and south to the northern third of Mexico.

Quebec. French-speaking Canada.

The Nation of Islam. Black separatists fantasize about a large Negro nation in eastern America, excluding a coastal strip from northern New Jersey to Massachusetts to be reserved for whites. A 100-mile-wide patrolled buffer zone would separate the "White American Bastion" from the Nation of Islam.

Black Boston. Prominent black politicians have demanded that Boston's Roxbury district and some tangential acreage secede from Boston and become the "free city" of Mandela.

New Confederacy. The South might rise again by means of a peaceful (this time) secession to form an independent Southern nation. The wishful thought is the principal plank in the platform of the small Southern Nationalist Party and the nostalgic dream of unreconstructed Southerners and Dixiecrats. In

contrast to what they fought for in the Civil War, many contemporary Southerners now desire separation from blacks more than they want separation from the United States.

Indian Territories. An increasing number of American Indians want their reservations given complete independence and removed from the control of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Republic of Five Northwestern States. The utopian proposal of the right-wing Aryan Nations, based in Idaho, and various members of the Identity Church, who believe they are the true descendants of the original Hebrews.

Eastern Canada. When and if Quebec separates from Anglophone Canada, the eastern provinces (Nova Scotia, Prince Edward, New Brunswick and Newfoundland) might apply for statehood in the United States or might seek the independent status acquired by Quebec.

Western Canada. A concept energetically pushed by lawyer Douglas Christie, a defender of Canadian right-wingers. The breakaway state would include all provinces west of Ontario.

Other Possibilities. America is replete with serious and frivolous suggestions for devolution. Not content with statehood, a considerable number of Americans are opting for forms of autonomy that are not too far removed from independence. Some Americans would like to see something like ethnostates pop up in the Ozarks and in other isolated parts of the country. Texas had a taste of independence in 1836-45, and more than a few Texans would like to repeat the experience.

An independent black nation representing about two-thirds of the South was proposed by the American Communist Party in the 1930s.

The maverick inhabitants of Key West say they want to quit Florida and become a "Conch Republic" or city state.

White separatists wish to carve an all-white nation out of the

eastern quarter of Washington, the northern quarter of Idaho and the northwest corner of Montana—a downsized version of the Republic of Five Northwestern States.

EUROPE

The ethnostate picture looks brighter in Europe. The eastern part of the continent is being rearranged to conform more with culture and race, now that the forced political, economic and social integration of Soviet imperialism has been ended. The renewed independence of the Baltic States, the birth or rebirth of several Slavic states, such as Belarus and Ukraine, and of various republics in the Caucasus and Central Asia leaves the Russian Federation, once the mother country of the Soviet Union, much poorer in territory and population, but more internally unified. Somewhat the same process, but with much more violence and bloodshed, is occurring in Yugoslavia, whose fission has already resulted in the independence of Slovenia, Croatia and, though still not certain at this writing, Bosnia-Herzegovina. This leaves Serbia and not much else to the Serbs. Another Slavic country, Czechoslovakia, has split into a Czech and a Slovak state.

In Western Europe there have been no drastic changes, but almost everywhere various groups and lobbies are pushing for some form of decentralization, whether it is restoration of the old provinces or outright secession to conform with racial and cultural boundaries. So far no genuine ethnostates have been created out of all this ferment, but the trend is definitely in that direction.

United Kingdom. Formed originally out of England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, Great Britain is slowly returning to its traditional components at the expense of the centralized state set up to administer the once immense but now defunct empire. Scotland and Wales are showing signs of spiraling off, and the Scottish National Party, which commands a respectable following, is dedicated to independence. A similar type of devolutionary agitation is being promoted by Welsh

nationalist groups. There is even some talk of autonomy for Cornwall, once a Gaelic-speaking land, like Wales and Scotland, though the last Cornish speaker died some years ago. Northern Ireland is a potential ethnostate, if its southern Irish population could be sorted out and either attached to Eire or given a small state of its own somewhere in the Six Counties. IRA terrorists expect that the Irish Protestants, if and when they are abandoned by Britain, will give up and be forcibly integrated into the Irish Republic.

France. Brittany and Normandy are provinces as old as France itself. Bretons and Normans are demanding, and to some extent receiving, greater autonomy from the French government, though by no means as much as the more radical factions of these two regions would like. That part of southern France, once known as Provence and Occitania, is also stirring with romantic visionaries bent on recapturing the lost glories of Provençal culture.

Belgium. Many members of the 60% of the population that speak Flemish are demanding an independent Flanders, which would leave the 40% of the Belgian population that speak French with a much smaller but more integrated state, which would probably be named Wallonia.

Holland. Some 60% of Friesians, two-thirds of whom speak a language fairly close to English, are seeking ever bigger doses of autonomy from the ruling Dutch majority.

Germany. The German government has granted so much independence to its *Länder* or states that any serious drive for further devolution has been temporarily sidetracked. Nevertheless, the country has such a long history of autonomous or semi-autonomous provinces and its people speak so many different dialects that the spirit of ethnostatism must be alive in many hearts, particularly in Bavaria, once a powerful kingdom in its own right. In this context, it is well to remember that Germany did not become one nation until 1866.

Scandinavia. One of two examples of divisiveness in this part of the world is the Laplanders, some 32,000 strong, who live in northern Norway, Sweden and the Kola peninsula of Russia. The other candidates for ethnostatehood are the 40,000 people of the Faeroe Islands (17 inhabited, 5 uninhabited), whose language resembles old Norse. An appendage of Denmark, the islands are located some 300 miles north of Scotland.

Spain. Basque terrorists are committed to the creation of Euzkadi, an independent homeland located on both the north and south side of the Pyrenees. Catalonia, with a rich cultural history of its own, has an active independence movement and the support of the world's largest anarchist party. Six million hard-working Catalans are unhappy about supplying Spain (population 40 million) with 40% of its tax revenues. The laid-back Andalusians in southern Spain have some cultural and racial traits that distinguish them from many northern Spaniards, a situation which may one day inspire the birth of an Andalusian ethnostate.

Italy. The Lombard League, which has already won a few seats in the Italian legislature, would like to divide Italy into two nations: one north of Rome, the other consisting of Rome, where Africa is said to begin, and everything south of the Italian capital, including Sicily. Up in the mountainous Italian Tyrol live 280,000 German speakers, most of whom, to be free of Italian politics, would prefer to be either independent or join Austria.

Mare Nostrum Islands. Corsica and Sardinia belong to France and Italy, respectively. Some day they may become model ethnostates. In the eastern Mediterranean, Crete has more than a few enthusiasts who would like to be free of Greece. The partition of Cyprus between Turks and Greeks will continue to be a political cancer that can best be cured by the formation of two ethnostates.

Bibliography

The following is a selective list of authors and their works, previously cited or alluded to, that deal in greater detail with some of the ideas and themes discussed in this book.

Bryan, Frank and John McClaughry. *The Vermont Papers: Recreating Democracy on a Human Scale.* Post Mills, Vermont: Chelsea Green Publishing Co., 1989.

Cattell, Raymond. *Beyondism: Religion from Science.* New York: Praeger, 1987.

Coon, Carleton. *The Races of Europe.* New York: Macmillan, 1954.

Darwin, Charles. *The Origin of Species* and *The Descent of Man.* New York: Modern Library.

Davidson, Donald. *Regionalism and Nationalism in the United States.* New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 1991.

Galton, Francis. *Hereditary Genius.* Gloucester, Massachusetts: Peter Smith, 1972.

Garreau, Joel. *Nine Nations of North America.* New York: Avon Books, 1981.

Gehlen, Arnold. *Moral und Hypermoral.* Bonn, Athenäum Verlag, 1969.

Harsanyi, Zsolt. *Genetic Prophecy:* New York: Ross & Wade.

Heidegger, Martin. *Sein und Zeit.* Tübingen, Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1977.

Jefferson, Thomas. *The Life and Selected Writings of Thomas Jefferson.* New York: Random House, 1944.

Kohr, Leopold. *The Breakdown of Nations*. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1978.

Kohr, Leopold, *The Overdeveloped Nations*. New York: Schocken Books, 1977.

McNeill, William. *The Rise of the West*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.

Naipaul, Shiva. *North & South: An African Journey*. New York,: Penguin Books, 1989.

Robertson, Wilmot. *The Dispossessed Majority*. Cape Canaveral, Florida: Howard Allen, 1981.

Schumacher, E.F. *Small Is Beautiful*. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr. *Letter to the Soviet Leaders*. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

Spengler, Oswald. *Der Untergang des Abendlandes*. Munich: Beck, 1920.

Wilson, E.O. Sociobiology: *The New Synthesis*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1975.

From the Foreword. . .

In an earlier book, *The Dispossessed Majority,* the author was hopeful, but not too hopeful, that a sharp white backlash to minority racism and cultural degeneration might save what appeared to be the doomed United States. Twenty years ago he still believed it possible that his moribund country could revive, clean out its political and cultural Augean Stables, and establish a *Pax Americana* that would herald a new age of peace, plenty and progress. Now that more than two decades have passed, events are proving that America, as we have known it, is beyond saving. The Majority, that is, the Northern and Western European elements of the population, has lost whatever chance it had to recapture the country it ruled for more than two centuries. Defeatist as it may sound, this does not mean it is too late to save the Majority as a people. . . .

What is called for is a new form of government that would transform socially destructive into socially constructive forces. Race, now actively tearing countries apart, might be helpful in putting them back together but this time in the form of autonomous, relatively self-sufficient collectivities that the author has chosen to designate as ethnostates. Since nothing else seems to be working, since every new day brings with it new demographic horrors, a little rethinking of the fundamental themes and axioms of modern statecraft might be in order.

Although the author is an American, he will not confine his remarks to what used to be his country but will aim many of them overseas. Inescapably, however, his emphasis will be on the United States, not only because of his birth and upbringing, but also because what is happening in the Western world in these parlous times is happening first in America. To employ Spengler's term, but without accepting his organic view of history, the Decline of the West is accelerating faster in the United States than elsewhere. Consequently, the suggestions advanced in this book for halting and reversing this decline should have the highest priority for the American Majority, the most threatened of white population groups everywhere, South African whites excepted. . . .

The Ethnostate is Wilmot Robertson's third book. His first, *The Dispossessed Majority*, was published in 1972 and updated editions came out every two or three years thereafter. As of 1992, more than 100,000 hardcover, softcover and condensed paperback copies had been sold. In 1974, the author's second book, *Ventilations,* a collection of essays was published.

The Ethnostate was composed in the years 1985-92, while Robertson continued his work as editor of *Instauration,* a monthly magazine dedicated to the small group of white Americans who are trying to prevent what was once their country from becoming a 20th-century down-the-tubes Sybaris and a 21st-century Brazil. *Instauration* is now in its 18th year.

Robertson, who was born in Philadelphia and studied at several colleges in the United States and abroad, also functions as the head of Howard Allen Enterprises, Inc., a book and magazine publisher, whose address is P.O. Box 76, Cape Canaveral, Florida 32920. Booklist available on request.